

*The* JOURNAL of  
SOUTHERN  
HISTORY

---

VOL. III

AUGUST, 1937

No. 3

---



*Published quarterly by the*  
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

# *The Journal of Southern History*

VOLUME III

AUGUST, 1937

NUMBER 3

*Published Quarterly by*

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

---

---

## BOARD OF EDITORS

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY  
University of Virginia

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY  
Vanderbilt University

RICHARD H. SHRYOCK  
Duke University

CHARLES S. SYDNOR  
Duke University

JOHN D. BARNHART  
Louisiana State University

WILLIAM O. LYNCH  
Indiana University

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL  
University of Texas

PHILIP DAVIDSON  
Agnes Scott College

## MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

## EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

## GUARANTOR

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

## OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

*President*—THOMAS P. ABERNETHY, University of Virginia

*Vice-President*—CHARLES S. SYDNOR, Duke University

*Secretary-Treasurer*—FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina

---

---

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at Baton Rouge, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

*The Journal of Southern History*  
VOLUME III      AUGUST, 1937      NUMBER 3



## CONTENTS

<i>Lincoln and Fort Sumter.</i> By Charles W. Ramsdell. . . . .	259
<i>From Tillman to Long: Some Striking Leaders of the Rural South.</i> By Daniel M. Robison. . . . .	289
<i>Survival of the Plantation System in Louisiana.</i> By Roger Wallace Shugg. . . . .	311
<i>Cultural Life in Nashville on the Eve of the Civil War.</i> By F. Garvin Davenport. . . . .	326
<i>Notes and Documents</i>	
Boyce-Hammond Correspondence. Edited by Rosser H. Taylor. . . . .	348
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Cotterill, <i>The Old South</i> , by Arthur C. Cole. . . . .	355
Hesseltine, <i>A History of the South, 1607-1936</i> , by Daniel M. Robison. . . . .	356
Johnson, <i>Scientific Interests in the Old South</i> , by Richard H. Shryock. . . . .	358
Woodson, <i>The African Background Outlined</i> , by James D. Glunt. . . . .	359
Catterall, <i>Judicial Cases concerning American Slavery and the Negro</i> , IV, by Ruhl J. Bartlett. . . . .	361
Pargellis, <i>Military Affairs in North America, 1748-1765</i> , by Philip Davidson. . . . .	362
Carter, <i>The Territorial Papers of the United States</i> , IV, by Philip M. Hamer. . . . .	363
Green, <i>George McDuffie</i> , by John Pomfret. . . . .	365
Lambert, <i>Presidential Politics in the United States, 1841-1844</i> , by George M. Stephenson. . . . .	366
Kellar, <i>Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist</i> , II, by Wendell H. Stephenson. . . . .	367
Rourke, <i>Audubon</i> , by Leslie M. Norton. . . . .	368
Van Court, <i>In Old Natchez</i> , by M. Swearingen. . . . .	370
Molyneaux, <i>The Romantic Story of Texas</i> , by William C. Binkley. . . . .	370
Dworaczyk, <i>The First Polish Colonies of America in Texas</i> , by R. L. Biesele. . . . .	372
Greer, <i>Bois d'Arc to Barb'd Wire, Ken Cary: Southwestern Frontier Born</i> , by Curtis Nunn. . . . .	373
Coulter, <i>William G. Brownlow, Fighting Parson of the Southern Highlands</i> , by Stanley J. Folmsbee. . . . .	374
Buck, <i>The Road to Reunion, 1865-1900</i> , by John D. Barnhart. . . . .	377
Arnett, <i>Claude Kitchin and the Wilson War Policies</i> , by Elmer Ellis. . . . .	379
<i>Historical News and Notes</i> . . . . .	381
Personal. . . . .	382
Historical Societies. . . . .	384
Bibliographical. . . . .	386
<i>Contributors</i> . . . . .	393

# Lincoln and Fort Sumter

*By* CHARLES W. RAMSDELL

When the Confederate batteries around Charleston Harbor opened fire on Fort Sumter in the early morning hours of April 12, 1861, they signaled the beginning of the most calamitous tragedy in the history of the American people. Because the Confederate authorities ordered the attack it is generally held that they were directly responsible for the horrors of the ensuing four years. Certainly that was the feeling in the North, then and afterwards, and it became the verdict of austere historians.

Whether the war was inevitable, in any case, is a question that need not be raised here. It has been the subject of endless disputation and is one to which no conclusive answer can be given. But even though it be conceded that if the conflict had not arisen from the Fort Sumter crisis it would have sprung from some other incident growing out of the secession of the "cotton states," the actual firing of the "first shot" placed the Southerners under a great moral and material disadvantage. The general Northern conviction that the "rebels" had made an unprovoked attack upon the little Federal garrison added thousands of volunteers to the Union armies and strengthened the determination of the Northern people to carry the struggle through to the complete subjugation of the South.

The Confederate leaders who ordered the bombardment were not vicious, feeble-minded, irresponsible, or inexperienced men. As even a casual investigation will show, they had been fully aware of the danger of taking the initiative in hostilities and had hoped for peace. How then could they be so blind as to place themselves at this manifest disadvantage?

The story of the development of the Fort Sumter crisis has been told many times, but it is so full of complexities that there is little wonder that many of its most significant features have been obscured with a resultant loss of perspective. On the one hand, most accounts have begun with certain assumptions which have affected the interpretation of the whole mass of evidence; on the other, too little credit has been given to Abraham Lincoln's genius for political strategy, which is truly surprising in view of all the claims that have been made for the abilities of that very remarkable man. The purpose of this paper is to place the facts already known in their logical and chronological order and to re-evaluate them in that setting in the belief that when thus arranged they will throw new light upon this momentous affair.

The early stages of the Sumter problem can be dealt with in summary form. It is well known that six days after the secession of South Carolina Major Robert Anderson, who had been stationed at Fort Moultrie in command of all the United States forces in Charleston Harbor, abandoned Moultrie and moved his command into the new and still unfinished Fort Sumter where he thought his force would be better able to resist attack. The South Carolina authorities evidently had had no intention of attacking him for they thought they had an understanding with President Buchanan for maintaining the military status quo; but they immediately occupied Fort Moultrie and Castle Pinckney and made protest to Buchanan, demanding that Anderson be sent back to Moultrie. Buchanan refused to admit their ground of protest or to order Anderson back; then early in January he ordered relief to be sent secretly to the garrison on a merchant steamer. This vessel, *The Star of the West*, was forced back from the entrance of the harbor by the military authorities of the state, and the South Carolinians were with some difficulty restrained by the leaders in other Southern states from assaulting Fort Sumter. Thereafter Buchanan refrained from the use of force, partly because Anderson insisted that he was in no danger, partly because he still hoped for some peaceful adjustment, if not by Congress itself, then by the Peace Conference which was soon to assemble in

Washington, and partly because he was averse during the last weeks of his term to beginning hostilities for which he was unprepared.

By February 1 six other cotton states had passed ordinances of secession and each of them, as a matter of precaution and largely because of the happenings at Charleston, seized the forts, arsenals, customs houses, and navy yards within its own borders. There were two exceptions, both in Florida. Fort Taylor, at Key West, was left undisturbed; and Fort Pickens, at the entrance of Pensacola Bay and on the extreme western tip of Santa Rosa Island, was occupied by a small Federal force much as Fort Sumter had been.

Since Fort Pickens plays a part in the development of the Sumter crisis, some explanation of the situation at that point becomes necessary. In the beginning this fort was not occupied by troops, but a company of artillery, under Lieutenant Adam J. Slemmer, was stationed at Barrancas Barracks, across the neck of the bay about a mile and a half to the north of Pickens, and close by the Navy Yard. The town of Pensacola was some six miles farther up the bay. On January 10 Lieutenant Slemmer, hearing that the governors of Florida and Alabama were about to send troops to seize the forts and the Navy Yard and in accordance with instructions from General Winfield Scott, removed his small command to Fort Pickens. On the twelfth the Navy Yard capitulated to the combined state forces under Colonel W. H. Chase. Chase then demanded the surrender of Fort Pickens, which Slemmer refused. After some further correspondence between the two opposing officers, a group of nine Southern senators in Washington, on January 18, urged that no attack should be made on Fort Pickens because it was "not worth a drop of blood."<sup>1</sup> These senators believed that the Republicans in Congress were hoping to involve the Buchanan administration in hostilities in order that war might open before Lincoln's inauguration. On January 29 an agreement was effected at Washington by Senator Stephen R. Mallory of Florida, and others, with President Buchanan

<sup>1</sup> *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (Washington, 1880-1901), Ser. I, Vol. I, 445-46. Hereafter cited as *Official Records*.

and his secretaries of War and the Navy to the effect that no reinforcement would be sent to Fort Pickens and no attack would be made upon it by the secessionists.<sup>2</sup> The situation at Fort Pickens then became somewhat like that at Fort Sumter; but there were certain differences. Fort Pickens did not threaten the town of Pensacola as Fort Sumter did Charleston; it was easily accessible from the sea if reinforcements should be decided upon; and there was no such excitement over its continued occupation by United States troops as there was about Sumter.

As soon as the new Confederate government was organized the Confederate Congress, on February 12, by resolution took charge of "questions existing between the several States of this Confederacy and the United States respecting the occupation of forts, arsenals, navy yards and other public establishments." This hurried action was taken in order to get the management of the Sumter question out of the hands of the impatient and rather headlong Governor Francis W. Pickens of South Carolina, who, it was feared, might precipitate war at any time.<sup>3</sup> In fact, the public mind, North and South, sensed accurately that the greatest danger to peace lay in Charleston Harbor.

This danger, of course, was in the irreconcilable views of the two governments concerning their respective claims to the fort. To the Washington officials Sumter was not merely the legal property of the Federal government; its possession was a symbol of the continuity and integrity of that government. To withdraw the garrison at the demand of the secessionists would be equivalent to acknowledging the legality of secession and the dissolution of the Union. There was also, especially with the military officials, a point of honor involved; they could not yield to threats of force. The attitude of the Southerners was based upon equally imperative considerations. In their view the Confederate States no longer had any connection with the government on the Potomac; they were as independent as that other seceded nation, Belgium. No independent government could maintain its own self-respect or the

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 355-56.

<sup>3</sup> *Journal of the Congress of the Confederate States of America*, 7 vols. (Washington, 1904-1905), I, 47; Samuel W. Crawford, *The Genesis of the Civil War: The Story of Sumter* (New York, 1887), 261-62.



respect of foreign governments if it permitted another to hold an armed fortress within the harbor of one of its principal cities. When South Carolina had ceded the site for the fortification it had done so for its own protection. That protection was now converted into a threat, for the guns of Sumter dominated not only every point in the harbor but the city of Charleston itself. We may conceive an analogous situation by supposing that Great Britain at the close of the American Revolution had insisted upon retaining a fortress within the harbor of Boston or of New York. The Confederate government could not, without yielding the principle of independence, abate its claims to the fort.

During the last six weeks of Buchanan's term the situation at Charleston remained relatively quiet. Anderson and his engineers did what they could to strengthen the defenses of Sumter; while the state and Confederate officers established batteries around the harbor both to repel any future relief expedition and, in case of open hostilities, to reduce the fort. Although Governor Pickens had wished to press demands for surrender and to attack the fort if refused, he had first sought the advice of such men as Governor Joseph E. Brown of Georgia and Jefferson Davis of Mississippi. Both advised against any such action, partly because they still had some hope of peace and partly because they saw the danger of taking the initiative.<sup>4</sup> Although Anderson was under constant surveillance, he was allowed free use of the mails and was permitted to purchase for his men fresh meats and vegetables in the Charleston market. Other necessities, which under army regulations he must procure from the regular supply departments of the army, he was not allowed to receive because that would be permitting the Federal government to send relief to the garrison and involve an admission of its right to retain the fort. Anderson consistently informed the authorities at Washington during this time that he was safe and that he could hold out indefinitely. The Confederate government, having taken over from the state all negotiations concerning the fort, was moving cautiously with the evident hope of avoiding hostilities. On February 15

<sup>4</sup> Crawford, *Genesis of the Civil War*, 263-68; Dunbar Rowland (ed.), *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist*, 10 vols. (Jackson, Miss., 1923), V, 36-37, 39-40.

the Confederate Congress by resolution requested President Davis to appoint three commissioners to negotiate with the United States "all questions of disagreement between the two governments" and Davis appointed them on February 25.<sup>5</sup> They reached Washington on March 5, the day after Lincoln's inauguration.

Southern as well as Northern men waited anxiously to learn what policy would be indicated by the new President of the United States in his inaugural address. It is not necessary to dwell long on what Abraham Lincoln said in that famous paper. He stated plainly that he regarded the Union as unbroken, the secession of the seven cotton states as a nullity. In this he merely took the position that Buchanan had taken. He also said that he would enforce the laws of the Union in all the states; but he immediately softened this declaration by saying that he would not use violence unless it should be forced upon the national authority. Then he added, "The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy and possess the property and places belonging to the government, and to collect the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion, no using of force against or among the people anywhere." And later on: "In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors." How is it possible to reconcile the declaration that he would occupy "the property and places belonging to the government" with the promise that the government would not assail his dissatisfied fellow countrymen who either held or claimed the right to those places? While ostensibly addressing the Southerners, was he really directing these last soothing words to the anxious antiwar elements in the North? Although it is improbable that he had this early any definite plan in mind, his warning that the secessionists would be the aggressors, if civil war should come, may be significant in view of what he was to be engaged in exactly a month from that day.

<sup>5</sup> *Journal of the Congress of the Confederate States*, I, 46, 52, 55, 85-86.

But the inaugural should not be regarded as the declaration of a definite program; for while the new President was careful to lay down the general principle that the Union was legally unbroken, he refrained with equal care from committing himself to any course of action. If he hedged at every point where a statement of active policy was expected, it was because he could not know what he would be able to do. Caution was necessary; it was not merely political expediency, it was at that juncture political wisdom. Cautious reticence, until he knew his way was clear, was a very marked trait of Abraham Lincoln.<sup>6</sup> There is another characteristic quality in this address. Lincoln had developed an extraordinary skill in so phrasing his public utterances as to arouse in each special group he singled out for attention just the reaction he desired. To the extreme and aggressive Republicans the inaugural indicated a firm determination to enforce obedience upon the secessionists; to the Northern moderates and peace advocates, as well as to the anxious Unionists of the border slave states, not yet seceded, it promised a conciliatory attitude; in the seceded states it was interpreted as threatening coercion and had the effect of hastening preparations for defense.

In the latter part of the address Lincoln had counseled the people generally to avoid precipitate action and to take time to think calmly about the situation. He doubtless hoped to be able to take time himself; but he discovered within a few hours that there was one problem whose solution could not be long postponed. On the very day of his inauguration Buchanan's secretary of war, Joseph Holt, received a letter from Major Anderson in which for the first time the commander at Fort Sumter expressed doubt of his ability to maintain himself. More than this, Anderson estimated that, in the face of the Confederate batteries erected about the harbor, it would require a powerful fleet and a force of twenty thousand men to give permanent relief to the garrison. Since

<sup>6</sup> This characteristic of Lincoln was attested to by numbers of his associates, sometimes with evident irritation. W. H. Herndon once wrote, "He was the most secretive—reticent—shut-mouthed man that ever lived." Herndon to J. E. Remsburg of Oak Mills, Kansas, September 10, 1887 (privately printed by H. E. Baker, 1917). See also A. K. McClure, *Lincoln and Men of War-Times* (Philadelphia, 1892), 64-68, for statements of Leonard Swett, W. H. Lamon, A. K. McClure, and David Davis. Judge Davis said, "I knew the man well; he was the most reticent, secretive man I ever saw or expect to see."

it was his last day in office, Buchanan had the letter referred to Lincoln; and when on March 5 Holt submitted it to the new President he accompanied it with a report sharply reviewing Anderson's previous assurances of his safety.<sup>7</sup> Lincoln called General Scott into conference and the General concurred with Anderson. After a few days of further consideration Scott was of the same opinion and was sustained by General Joseph G. Totten, chief of the Army Engineers. These men considered the question primarily as a military problem, although Scott could not refrain from injecting political considerations into his written statement. In doing this the aged General was suspected of following the lead of Secretary William H. Seward who was already urging the evacuation of Sumter, in order to avoid precipitating hostilities at that point, and the reinforcement of Fort Pickens in order to assert the authority of the government. Lincoln accepted at least a part of Seward's plan, for on March 12, General Scott, by the President's direction, sent an order to Captain Israel Vogdes, whose artillery company was on board the U. S. Steamer *Brooklyn*, lying off Fort Pickens, directing him to land his company, reinforce Pickens, and hold it. Instead of sending the order overland, Scott sent it around by sea with the result that it did not reach its destination until April 1, and then the navy captain in command of the ship on which the artillery company was quartered refused to land the troops because the orders from the former Secretary of the Navy directing him to respect the truce with the Confederates had never been countermanded. The fort was not reinforced at that time, a fact of which Lincoln remained ignorant until April 6. We shall return to the Fort Pickens situation later.

Meanwhile Lincoln was considering the Fort Sumter problem. He had learned that Anderson's supplies were running short and that the garrison could not hold out much longer without relief. Although both General Scott and General Totten had advised that the relief of the fort was impracticable with the forces available, Gustavus V. Fox, a former officer of the navy and a brother-in-law of Postmaster-General

<sup>7</sup> Anderson's letter has not been located, but see *Official Records*, Ser. I, Vol. I, 197-202. For Holt's letter, Horatio King, *Turning on the Light* (Philadelphia, 1896), 126-28.

Montgomery Blair, believed that it would be possible to reach the fort by running small steamers past the Confederate batteries at the entrance to the harbor. Fox had first proposed this to Scott early in February; he now came forward again with the backing of Montgomery Blair and presented his plan and arguments to Lincoln on March 13. The President seems to have been impressed, for on March 15 he asked for the written opinions of his cabinet on the question whether, assuming that it was now possible to provision Sumter, it was wise to attempt it. All, save Montgomery Blair, advised against an expedition.<sup>8</sup> Apparently this overwhelming majority of his cabinet at first decided him against the plans, for there is considerable evidence, although it is not conclusive, that he was about to order Anderson to evacuate. Certainly rumors of impending orders for evacuation were coming from various high official circles in Washington, aside from those for which Seward seems to have been responsible.<sup>9</sup> There is the familiar story of how old Frank Blair, brought to the White House by his son Montgomery, found the President about to sign the evacuation order and protested so vigorously that Lincoln did not sign it.

Lincoln now found himself facing a most difficult and dangerous situation and the more he considered it the more troublesome it appeared. It seems reasonably certain that he never wanted to give up Sumter. As early as December 24, 1860, having heard a wild rumor that the forts in South Carolina were to be surrendered by the order or consent of President Buchanan, he had written from Springfield to Senator Lyman Trumbull that he would, "if our friends at Washington concur, announce publicly at once that they are to be retaken after the inauguration."<sup>10</sup> After he had arrived at Washington and had taken

<sup>8</sup> Secretary Chase favored a relief expedition, but only if it would not bring on an expensive war, a position that was so equivocal that he can hardly be said to stand with Montgomery Blair. John G. Nicolay and John Hay (eds.), *Abraham Lincoln: Complete Works*, 2 vols. (New York, 1894), II, 11-22, for replies of the cabinet.

<sup>9</sup> The newspapers carried these reports almost every day and the belief in their accuracy seems to have been general, even among the war faction of the Republicans.

<sup>10</sup> Gilbert A. Tracy, *Uncollected Letters of Abraham Lincoln* (Boston and New York, 1917), 173. Lincoln had written "confidentially" to Major David Hunter on December 22, "If the forts fall, my judgment is that they are to be retaken." A. B. Lapsley (ed.), *The Writings of Abraham Lincoln*, 8 vols. (New York, 1905-1906), V, 199. It will be remem-

up the burden of office he saw that the problem was not so simple as it had looked from the frontier town of Springfield. His Secretary of State, a man of far greater political experience than himself, was urging him to make his stand for the authority of the government at Fort Pickens and not at Sumter, for Seward could not see how it would be possible to reinforce Sumter without putting the administration in the position of the aggressor. That would be a fatal mistake. Fort Pickens, on the other hand, could be relieved from the Gulf side without coming into direct conflict with the Confederates.

It would be extremely interesting to know what was passing through Lincoln's mind during those difficult days when, bedeviled by importunate office seekers, he could find little time for considering what he should do about the re-establishment of Federal authority in the seceded states and especially about the imperiled fort at Charleston. As was his habit, he left few clues to his reflections and it is impossible to say with assurance what ideas he picked up, examined, and discarded. One plan which he seems to have entertained for a short while, just after the adverse cabinet vote on relieving Sumter, contemplated the collection of customs duties on revenue vessels, supported by ships of war, just outside the Confederate ports; and there were hints in the press that Anderson's force was to be withdrawn to a ship off Charleston. If it were seriously considered, the plan was soon abandoned, possibly because of legal impediments or more probably because it did not fully meet the needs of the situation.<sup>11</sup> But although Lincoln kept his

bered that the original draft of the inaugural had contained a declaration that he would "reclaim the public property and places which have fallen," but that this was changed at the suggestion of Orville H. Browning to a more general and less threatening statement. John G. Nicolay and John Hay, *Abraham Lincoln, A History*, 10 vols. (New York, 1886-1892), III, 319, 333-34, n. 12.

<sup>11</sup> Lincoln to Chase, Welles, and Bates, March 18, 1861, in Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Lincoln: Works*, II, 24-25. The Morrill tariff, passed in February, had raised rates far above the former ones while the Confederate Congress had enacted a low tariff. The difference in rates was causing anxiety to Northern importers and shippers, and also to the administration, lest it deflect imports to the South and stimulate smuggling across the new border to the great injury of the Northern ports and the loss of customs receipts. The tariff differential might even swing some of the border states over to the Confederacy. The *New York Times* was greatly disturbed at the prospect and roundly condemned the Morrill tariff. The issues of the *Times* for March 13, 15-20, and 22, intimated that the President

thoughts to himself he must have studied public opinion closely, and we may be able to follow his thinking if we examine for ourselves the attitudes of the several groups in the North as they revealed themselves in those uncertain days of March.

It must not be forgotten that, notwithstanding Lincoln's smashing victory in the free states in November, his party was still new and relatively undisciplined. His support had come from a heterogeneous mass of voters and for a variety of reasons. The slavery issue, the drive for a protective tariff and internal improvements, the promise of free homesteads in the West, and disgust at the split among the Democrats had each played its part. Many voters had been persuaded that there was no real danger of a disruption of the Union in the event of his election. The secession of the border states had now thrown the former issues into the background and thrust to the front the question whether the discontented Southerners should be allowed to depart in peace or whether the government should, as Lincoln phrased it, "enforce the laws" and in so doing bring on war with the newly formed Confederacy. As always, when a new and perilous situation arises, the crosscurrents of public opinion were confusing. As Lincoln, pressed on all sides, waited while he studied the drift, he could not fail to note that there was a strong peace party in the North which was urging the settlement of difficulties without resort to force. On the other hand the more aggressive party men among the Republicans, to whom he was under special obligations, were insisting that he exert the full authority of the government even to the extent of war. This group included some of the most active and powerful members of his party whom he could not afford to antagonize. One disturbing factor in the situation was the marked tendency of many voters who had supported him in November to turn against the Republicans, as was shown in a number of local elections in Ohio and New England. While the peace men attributed

was considering the above-mentioned plan. The legal impediments seem to have consisted in the absence of any law of Congress permitting such a procedure and the nonexistence of local Federal courts for the adjudication of cases arising out of the enforcement of the revenue laws. This tariff question may have had more influence upon the final determination of Lincoln's policy than the evidence now available shows.

this reversal to fear of war, the more aggressive Republicans insisted that it was caused by disgust at the rumors that Fort Sumter would be given up to the secessionists.<sup>12</sup> Reinforcing the Northern conservatives were the majorities in the eight border slave states who had thus far refused to secede but who were openly opposed to any "coercive" action against their brethren in the Lower South. The Virginia State Convention, which had convened on February 13 and was in complete control of the conditional Unionists, was still in session, evidently awaiting his decision. Therefore, if he should adopt a strongly aggressive policy he might find himself opposed by the large group of peace men in the North while he precipitated most if not all of the border slave states into secession and union with the Confederacy.<sup>13</sup> If, on the other hand, he failed to act decisively, he was very likely to alienate the radical Republicans who were already manifesting impatience. In either case he would divide his party at the very beginning of his administration and increase the risk of utter failure. There was, however, some cheering evidence among the business elements of a growing irritation against the secessionists because of the depression which had set in with the withdrawal of South Carolina; and if the Confederates should add further offense to their low tariff policy or adopt more aggressive tactics with respect to the forts, this feeling might grow strong enough to overcome the peace men.

He had promised to maintain the Union, but how was he to attempt it without wrecking his chances at the very outset? It was now too late to restore the Union by compromise because, having himself rejected

<sup>12</sup> These elections were not actually held until April 1 in Ohio and Connecticut and April 3 in Rhode Island, but the pre-election evidences of defection had greatly alarmed the Republicans in the latter part of March. The fusion of the Democrats and other "Union-savers" carried all the larger cities of Ohio, defeated two radical Republican congressmen in Connecticut, re-elected Governor William Sprague in Rhode Island, and won a majority of the legislature in that state. *Cincinnati Commercial*, April 3, 1861; *Columbus (Ohio) Crisis*, April 4, 1861; *New York Times*, March 30, April 2, 4, 1861; J. H. Jordan to S. P. Chase, March 27, J. N. and J. B. Antram to Chase, April 2, and W. D. Beckham to Chase, April 2, 1861, in Chase Papers, Library of Congress. I am indebted to Mrs. W. Mary Bryant of the University of Texas for copies of these letters.

<sup>13</sup> There are some indications, however, that at this time Lincoln overestimated the Unionist strength in the border slave states.



all overtures in December, he could not now afford to offer what he had recently refused. Moreover, there was no indication that the Confederates would accept at this late date any compromise he might proffer. He must do something, for the gradual exhaustion of the supplies of the garrison in Fort Sumter would soon force his hand. He could not order Anderson to evacuate without arousing the wrath of the militant Unionists in the North. If he continued to let matters drift, Anderson himself would have to evacuate when his supplies were gone. While that would relieve the administration of any charge of coercion, it would expose the government to the accusation of disgraceful weakness and improve the chances of the Confederacy for foreign recognition.<sup>14</sup> If he left Anderson to his fate and made ostentatious display of reinforcing Fort Pickens, as Seward was urging him to do, would he gain as much as he lost? Was it not best, even necessary, to make his stand at Sumter? But if he should try to relieve Anderson by force of arms, what was the chance of success? Anderson, supported by the high authority of General Scott, thought there was none. If, as Captain Fox believed, swift steamers could run the gauntlet of the Confederate batteries and reach the fort with men and supplies, would they then be able to hold it against attack? Failure in this military movement might seriously damage the already uncertain prestige of the administration. Would it not be looked upon as aggressive war by the border state men and perhaps by the peace men in the North? Could he risk the handicap of appearing to force civil war upon the country? In every direction the way out of his dilemma seemed closed.

There was one remote possibility: the Confederates themselves might precipitate matters by attacking Sumter before Anderson should be

<sup>14</sup> Lincoln's special message to Congress, July 4, 1861, indicates that he had weighed some of these considerations. "It was believed, however, that to abandon that position [Sumter] under the circumstances would be utterly ruinous; that the *necessity* under which it was to be done would not be fully understood; that by many it would be construed as a part of a *voluntary* policy; that at home it would discourage the friends of the Union, embolden its adversaries, and go far to insure to the latter a recognition abroad; that, in fact, it would be our national destruction consummated. This could not be allowed." J. D. Richardson (comp.), *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, 10 vols. (Washington, 1896-1899), VI, 21.

compelled to evacuate by lack of supplies. But the Confederates, though watchful, were showing great caution. General P. G. T. Beauregard, in command at Charleston since March 6, was treating Major Anderson with elaborate courtesy. The government at Montgomery was in no hurry to force the issue, partly because it was quite well aware of the danger of assuming the aggressive and partly because it was waiting to see what its commissioners would be able to effect at Washington, where Seward was holding out hopes to them of the eventual evacuation of Sumter. At some time, while turning these things over in his mind, this daring thought must have occurred to Lincoln: Could the Southerners be *induced* to attack Sumter, to assume the aggressive and thus put themselves in the wrong in the eyes of the North and of the world?<sup>15</sup> If they could, the latent irritation perceptible among the Northern moderates might flame out against the secessionists and in support of the government. The two wings of his party would unite, some at least of the Democrats would come to his support, even the border-state people might be held, if they could be convinced that the war was being forced by the secessionists. Unless he could unite them in defense of the authority of the government, the peaceable and the "stiff-backed" Republicans would split apart, the party would collapse, his administration would be a failure, and he would go down in history as a weak man who had allowed the Union to crumble in his hands. As things now stood, the only way by which the Union could be restored, his party and his administration saved, was by an unequivocal assertion of the authority of the government, that is, through war. But he must not openly

<sup>15</sup> It would be most surprising to find that such an idea never occurred to Lincoln, since not only were many Republicans suggesting it as a possibility, but various Republican newspapers were constantly reiterating the suggestion that if any clash came the secessionists would be responsible. The predictions of the newspapers may have been "inspired," but if so, that fact makes it more certain that the idea was being discussed in the inner circles of the administration. J. H. Jordan wrote Chase from Cincinnati, March 27, "In the name of God! why not hold the Fort? Will reinforcing & holding it cause the rebels to attack it, and thus bring on 'civil war'? What of it? That is just what the government ought to wish to bring about, and ought to do all it can . . . to bring about. Let them attack the Fort, if they will—it will then be *them* that commence the war." The general idea of such an outcome was in the air; the contribution of Lincoln himself was the maneuver by which this desirable solution was brought about.

assume the aggressive; that must be done by the secessionists. The best opportunity was at Fort Sumter, but the time left was short for Anderson was running short of essential supplies.

Let us examine closely what Lincoln did after the middle of March, taking care to place each movement as nearly as possible in its exact sequence. We have seen that Captain Fox made his argument to Lincoln for a combined naval and military expedition on March 13 and that the cabinet, with the exception of Montgomery Blair and the equivocal Chase, had voted against it on the fifteenth. Fox then offered to go in person to Fort Sumter to investigate the situation and Lincoln gave him permission. He arrived in Charleston on March 21 and was allowed to see Anderson that night. He and Anderson agreed that the garrison could not hold out longer than noon of April 15. Although Anderson seems to have remained unconvinced of its feasibility, Fox returned to Washington full of enthusiasm for his plan.

On the very day that Fox arrived in Charleston, Lincoln had dispatched to that city a close friend and loyal supporter, Ward H. Lamon, a native of Virginia and his former law partner in Illinois. This sending of Lamon on the heels of Fox is an interesting incident. The precise nature of his instructions has never been fully revealed. Lamon himself, in his *Recollections*, merely says he was sent "on a confidential mission" and intimates that he was to report on the extent of Unionist feeling in South Carolina. He arrived in Charleston on the night of Saturday, March 23; visited James L. Petigru, the famous Unionist, on Sunday and learned from him that there was no Unionist strength in the state, that "peaceable secession or war was inevitable"; and on Monday morning obtained an interview with Governor Pickens. In reply to questions the Governor stated very positively that any attempt on the part of President Lincoln to reinforce Sumter would bring on war, that only his "unalterable resolve *not* to attempt any reinforcement" could prevent war. Lamon, whether through innocence or guile, left the impression with the Governor, and also with Anderson whom he was permitted to visit, that the garrison would soon be withdrawn and that his trip was merely to prepare the way for that event. He left Charles-

ton on the night of the twenty-fifth, arrived in Washington on the twenty-seventh, and reported to Lincoln what he had learned.<sup>16</sup> What had he been sent to Charleston to do? There must have been some purpose and it could hardly have been to prepare the way for Anderson's evacuation.<sup>17</sup> Does it strain the evidence to suggest that it was chiefly to find out at first hand how strong was the Southern feeling about relief for Fort Sumter and that this purpose was camouflaged by the vague intimations of evacuation? But it is quite probable that Lamon himself did not understand the real purpose, for it is altogether unlikely that the cautious Lincoln would have divulged so important a secret to his bibulous and impulsive young friend. But if there was such an ulterior purpose, Lincoln now had the information directly from Charleston that any sort of relief would result in an attack upon the fort.

According to Gideon Welles, whose account of these events was written several years later, Lincoln sometime in the latter half of March had informed the members of his cabinet that he would send relief to Sumter. During a cabinet meeting on March 29 (two days after Lamon's return), when the matter was again discussed, Lincoln, at the suggestion of Attorney General Edward Bates, again requested each member to give his opinion in writing on the question of relieving Sumter. Whether Lincoln's known determination, political pressure, or some other influence had effected it, there was a marked change from the advice given just two weeks earlier. Now only Seward and Caleb Smith were for evacuating Sumter, but they both wished to reinforce Fort Pickens. Bates proposed to strengthen Pickens and Key West and said that the time had come either to evacuate Sumter or relieve it. The rest were unequivocally for a relief expedition. Later that day Lincoln

<sup>16</sup> Ward H. Lamon, *Recollections of Abraham Lincoln* (Washington, 1911), 68-79.

<sup>17</sup> On April 1 Lincoln sent word, through Seward, to Justice John A. Campbell that Lamon had no authority to make such a promise. Not only that but, according to the same source, he stated that "Lamon did not go to Charleston under any commission or authority from Mr. Lincoln." Henry G. Connor, *John Archibald Campbell* (Boston and New York, 1920), 127. The words "commission or authority" may have been a mere technical evasion of responsibility, for Lamon himself recounts the conversation between Lincoln, Seward, and himself when Lincoln asked him to go. It is possible, of course, that Justice Campbell misunderstood the exact language or meaning of Seward.

directed the secretaries of War and the Navy to co-operate in preparing an expedition to move by sea as early as April 6. The destination was not indicated in the order, but it was Charleston.<sup>18</sup>

On the same day Seward, intent upon the reinforcement of Fort Pickens, brought Captain M. C. Meigs of the Engineers to Lincoln to discuss an expedition to that place. On March 31 Meigs and Colonel Erasmus D. Keyes, of General Scott's staff, were directed to draw up a plan for the relief of Fort Pickens. They took it to Lincoln who had them take it to Scott to be put into final form and executed. On the next day, April 1, Seward, Meigs, and Lieutenant D. D. Porter of the navy went to the Executive Mansion and after consultation with Lincoln finished the plans for the Pickens expedition. It was to be conducted with such absolute secrecy, lest information leak out to the Confederates, that even the secretaries of War and the Navy were to know nothing of it. The orders were signed by the President himself. It was only because the same ship, the *Powhatan*, was selected for both expeditions that the Secretary of the Navy learned of the expedition to the Gulf of Mexico.<sup>19</sup> Energetic preparations began in New York and Brooklyn to collect vessels, men, arms, and provisions for the two expeditions.

In the first days of April came the disquieting returns from the elections in Ohio, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. April 4 proved to be an important day. Early that morning Lincoln seems to have had a mysterious conference with a group of Republican governors, said to be seven or nine in number. Among them were Andrew G. Curtin of Pennsylvania, William Dennison of Ohio, Richard Yates of Illinois, Oliver P. Morton of Indiana, Israel Washburn of Maine, and Austin Blair of Michigan.<sup>20</sup> How did all these governors happen to be in

<sup>18</sup> Howard K. Beale (ed.), *The Diary of Edward Bates, 1859-1866*, in American Historical Association, *Annual Report, 1930* (Washington, 1933), IV, 180; Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Lincoln: Works*, II, 25-28.

<sup>19</sup> John T. Morse (ed.), *The Diary of Gideon Welles*, 3 vols. (Boston and New York, 1911), I, 23-25. Hereafter cited as Welles, *Diary*. David D. Porter, in *Incidents and Anecdotes of the Civil War* (New York, 1885), 13-14, tells a lively and rather amusing story of the conference with Lincoln on April 1.

<sup>20</sup> *New York World*, April 5, 1861; *New York Herald*, April 5, 7, 1861; Philadelphia

Washington at the same time? The newspapers, in so far as they noticed the presence of these gentlemen, assumed that they were looking after patronage; but rumors were soon current that they had gone to demand of the President that he send relief to the garrison at Fort Sumter. This is not improbable since all these men belonged to the aggressive group of Republicans who had been alarmed at the rumors of evacuation and they could hardly have known what Lincoln had already planned. Several questions arise here. If Lincoln was still hesitating, did they bring pressure upon him and force him to a decision? Or did Lincoln allow them to think they were helping him to decide? Or, if the President had not actually summoned them to a conference, did he seize the opportunity to make sure of their powerful support in case the Confederates should show fight? Were mutual pledges of action and support exchanged that morning?

Later that same morning occurred the much-discussed Lincoln-Baldwin interview. On April 2, apparently at the suggestion of Seward, Lincoln had sent Allan B. Magruder, a Virginia Unionist living in Washington, to Richmond to ask G. W. Summers, the leader of the Unionists in the State Convention, to come to see him at once or to send some other representative from that group. Magruder reached Richmond the next day. As Summers could not leave, John B. Baldwin, another leader of the group, was selected; and Baldwin and Magruder were in Washington early on the morning of April 4. They went to Seward who conducted Baldwin to Lincoln at eleven o'clock. Lincoln took Baldwin alone into a bedroom, locked the door and exclaimed "You have come too late!" In the conversation which followed, according to Baldwin's statement, the President asked why the Unionists in the Virginia Convention did not adjourn sine die, as the continuance of

*Enquirer*, April 6, 1861; James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States since the Compromise of 1850*, 8 vols. (New York, 1910 edition), III, 346, n. 3. John B. Baldwin, who had an interview with Lincoln later that morning, testified on February 10, 1866, "At the time I was here I saw, and was introduced to, in the President's room, a number of governors of states. It was at the time the nine governors had the talk here with the President." *Report of the Joint Committee on Reconstruction* (39 Cong., 1 Sess., House Report No. 30), 105. As several of these governors were in Washington for three or four days, it is possible that the conferences extended over several days, from about April 3 to 6.

the session was a standing menace to him. Baldwin replied that if they should so adjourn without having accomplished anything for the security of the state, another convention would certainly be called and it would be more strongly secessionist. He then urged the President to assure peace to the country and strengthen the border-state Unionists by evacuating both Sumter and Pickens and calling upon the whole people to settle their differences in a national convention. Lincoln replied that his supporters would not permit him to withdraw the garrisons. Baldwin then warned him that if a fight started at Fort Sumter, no matter who started it, war would follow and Virginia would go out of the Union in forty-eight hours. Lincoln became greatly excited and exclaimed, "Why was I not told this a week ago? You have come too late!" This is Baldwin's account;<sup>21</sup> but it is substantiated by several other Virginia Unionists, at least to the extent that it was what Baldwin told them when he returned to Richmond the next day.

But John Minor Botts, a violent Virginia Unionist who by invitation talked with Lincoln on the night of April 7, insisted that Lincoln then told him that he had offered to Baldwin to withdraw Anderson's force from Sumter if the Virginia Convention would adjourn sine die, that he would gladly swap a fort for a state; but that Baldwin refused the offer. When Botts offered to take the proposition to Richmond at once Lincoln replied, "Oh, it is too late; the fleet has sailed and I have no means of communicating with it."<sup>22</sup>

Baldwin always denied that Lincoln had made any such proposal as Botts reported. Did Baldwin lie? He seems to have had a much better reputation for accuracy than Botts and his account of his journey to Washington is accurate as far as it can be checked, whereas Botts' story is full of minor inaccuracies.<sup>23</sup> Besides, Baldwin was a sincere Unionist and voted against secession to the last. Why should he have refused

<sup>21</sup> Baldwin's testimony, *Report of Joint Committee on Reconstruction*, 102-107; J. B. Baldwin, *Interview between President Lincoln and John B. Baldwin, April 4, 1861* (Staunton, Va., 1866).

<sup>22</sup> Botts' testimony, *Report of Joint Committee on Reconstruction*, 114-19; John Minor Botts, *The Great Rebellion* (New York, 1866), 194-202.

<sup>23</sup> The most recent and also the most judicial summary of all the evidence is by Henry T. Shanks, *The Secession Movement in Virginia, 1847-1861* (Richmond, 1934), 192-95.

Lincoln's offer and failed to report it to his fellow Unionists in Richmond? Did Botts lie about what Lincoln told him? His extreme prejudices and frequently unwarranted statements on other matters would easily bring this conclusion into the range of possibility, were it not for the fact that Lincoln seems to have told much the same story to others. If Lincoln did, then the question whether the President offered to evacuate Sumter at this stage of his plan becomes an issue of veracity between Lincoln and Baldwin, which obviously places the Virginian at a great disadvantage. But let us consider other factors in the situation. Lincoln had just been holding conferences with the militant Republican governors and evidently had come to some agreement with them, else why should he greet his visitor with the exclamation, repeated later in the conversation, "You have come too late"? Certainly he could not have referred to the final orders to Fox, for those orders were given later that day. And why did he refuse on the night of April 7, if the Botts story is correct, to permit Botts to take his proposition to Richmond, alleging that the fleet had sailed, when in fact none of the vessels left New York until the next night? Is there not some basis for suspecting that Lincoln had not actually made the offer to Baldwin to evacuate Sumter because he was already bound by some sort of agreement with the Republican governors to send the expedition forward; and that later, desiring above all things to leave the impression that he had done everything in his power to avoid a collision, he dropped hints about an offer which had been flatly refused?

During the afternoon of April 4 Lincoln saw Captain Fox, who was to have charge of the Sumter expedition, and told him of his final determination to send relief to Anderson and that notification of the relief expedition would be sent to the Governor of South Carolina before Fox could possibly arrive off Charleston Harbor.<sup>24</sup> Fox hurried back to New York to push his preparations. At some time that same day Lincoln drafted a letter to Major Anderson, which was copied and

<sup>24</sup> Crawford, *Genesis of the Civil War*, 404; William E. Smith, *The Francis Preston Blair Family in Politics*, 2 vols. (New York, 1933), II, 12-13.



signed by the Secretary of War, informing him that relief would be sent him.<sup>25</sup>

On the afternoon of April 6 Secretary Welles received a letter from Captain Henry A. Adams of the navy, stationed off Fort Pickens, explaining that he had not landed the artillery company at the fort in accordance with General Scott's order of March 12 because of controlling orders from the former Secretary of the Navy to respect the truce of February 29, but stating that he was now ready to obey if ordered to land the men. Welles consulted the President and then hurried off Lieutenant John L. Worden with verbal orders to Captain Adams to land the men at once.<sup>26</sup> This incident gave occasion for a strange statement of Lincoln which deserves notice. In his special message to Congress of July 4, he stated that the expedition for the relief of Sumter was first prepared "to be ultimately used or not according to circumstances," and intimated that, if Pickens had been relieved in March, Sumter would have been evacuated, and that it had not been decided to use the expedition until word came that Fort Pickens had not been reinforced in accordance with the order of March 12.<sup>27</sup> The strange thing about this statement is that word was not received from Adams until April 6, while positive orders had been given two days before to Captain Fox to go ahead with his expedition and at the same time Anderson had been notified to expect it. Had Lincoln become confused about the order of these events? It does not seem probable. Or was he, for effect upon public opinion, trying to strengthen the belief that his hand had been forced, that his pacific intentions had been defeated by circumstances?

On April 1 Lincoln had passed the promise through Seward and Justice John A. Campbell to the Confederate Commissioners in Washington that he would notify Governor Pickens if any relief expedition should be sent to Fort Sumter.<sup>28</sup> When they learned of it, several

<sup>25</sup> Nicolay and Hay, *Abraham Lincoln*, IV, 27-28.

<sup>26</sup> Welles, *Diary*, I, 29-32. Worden reached Captain Adams' ship on April 12 and the men were landed that night, the very day on which the firing began at Sumter.

<sup>27</sup> Richardson (comp.), *Messages and Papers*, VI, 21-22.

<sup>28</sup> Connor, *John Archibald Campbell*, 127-28. Lincoln chose to send the notification to the Governor, not the Confederate officers, because he could recognize the former and not the latter.

members of his cabinet objected to such notification, but Lincoln insisted; he had his own reasons for so doing. The formal notice which he drafted with his own hand, dated April 6, is interesting not only for its careful phrasing but for the evident importance which he attached to it. It was embodied in a letter of instruction to R. S. Chew, an official of the state department who was to be accompanied by Captain Theodore Talbot, directing him to proceed to Charleston where, if he found that Fort Sumter had not been evacuated or attacked and that the flag was still over it, he was to seek an interview with Governor Pickens, read to him the statement and give him a copy of it. If he found the fort evacuated or attacked he was to seek no interview but was to return forthwith. The message to Governor Pickens was in these words:

"I am directed by the President of the United States to notify you to expect an attempt will be made to supply Fort Sumter with provisions only; and that, if such an attempt be not resisted, no effort to throw in men, arms, or ammunition will be made without further notice, or in case of an attack upon the fort."<sup>29</sup>

Was the purpose of this message merely to fulfill a promise? Is there not special significance in the fact that Lincoln entrusted the form of it to no one else, but carefully drafted it himself? It is unnecessary to call attention again to the fact that Lincoln was a rare master of the written word, that he had the skill of an artist in so phrasing a sentence that it conveyed precisely the meaning he wished it to convey. He could do more than that: he could make the same sentence say one thing to one person and something entirely different to another and in each case carry the meaning he intended. It is obvious that the message to be read to Governor Pickens was intended less for that official than for General Beauregard and the Confederate government at Montgomery. But it was intended also for the people of the North and of the border states. To the suspicious and apprehensive Confederates it did not merely give information that provisions would be sent to Anderson's garrison—which should be enough to bring about an attempt to take the fort—but it carried a threat that force would be used if the provisions were not allowed to be brought in. It was a direct challenge! How were the

<sup>29</sup> Nicolay and Hay, *Abraham Lincoln*, IV, 34.

Southerners expected to react to this challenge? To Northern readers the same words meant only that the government was taking food to hungry men to whom it was under special obligation. Northern men would see no threat; they would understand only that their government did not propose to use force if it could be avoided. Is it possible that a man of Lincoln's known perspicacity could be blind to the different interpretations which would be placed upon his subtle words in the North and in the South?

The message was not only skillfully phrased, it was most carefully timed. It was read to Governor Pickens in the presence of General Beauregard on the evening of April 8. News of the preparation of some large expedition had been in the newspapers for a week; but as the destination had not been officially divulged, newspaper reporters and correspondents had guessed at many places, chiefly the coast of Texas and revolutionary Santo Domingo. It was not until April 8 that the guessing veered toward Charleston, and not until the next day was any positive information given in the press of the notice to Governor Pickens.<sup>30</sup> The Confederate officials had regarded these preparations at New York with suspicion while conflicting reports came to them from Washington concerning Lincoln's designs about Sumter. The first of Captain Fox's vessels were leaving New York Harbor at the very hour that Chew read the notification to Governor Pickens. The Confederates were given ample time, therefore, to act before the fleet could arrive off Charleston. They did not know that a portion of the vessels which had left New York were really destined not for Charleston but for Fort Pickens at Pensacola. The utmost secrecy was maintained about the Pensacola expedition, thus permitting the Confederates to believe that the whole force was to be concentrated at Charleston.

The tables were now completely turned on the Southerners. Lincoln was well out of his dilemma while they, who had heretofore had the tactical advantage of being able to wait until Anderson must evacuate,

<sup>30</sup> *New York Times*, April 8, 1861; *Baltimore Sun*, April 8, 1861. The *Richmond Examiner* asserted as early as April 6 that the expedition was for the purpose of relieving Sumter.

were suddenly faced with a choice of two evils. They must either take the fort before relief could arrive, thus taking the apparent offensive which they had hoped to avoid, or they must stand by quietly and see the fort provisioned. But to allow the provisioning meant not only an indefinite postponement to their possession of the fort which had become as much a symbol to them as it was to Lincoln; to permit it in the face of the threat of force, after all their preparations, would be to make a ridiculous and disgraceful retreat.<sup>31</sup> Nor could they be sure that, if they yielded now in the matter of "provisions only," they would not soon be served with the "further notice" as a prelude to throwing in "men, arms, and ammunition." This, then, was the dilemma which they faced as the result of Lincoln's astute strategy.

Events now hurried to the inevitable climax. As soon as President Lincoln's communication was received General Beauregard telegraphed the news to the Confederate secretary of war, L. P. Walker. Walker at once ordered that the Sumter garrison be isolated by stopping its mails and the purchase of provisions in Charleston. On this same day the Confederate commissioners at Washington had received a copy of a memorandum filed in the state department by Seward, dated March 15, in which the Secretary declined to hold any official intercourse with them. They telegraphed the news to their government and at once, feeling that they had been deceived and knowing that their mission had failed, prepared to leave Washington. Jefferson Davis was thus, on April 8, apprised of two movements by the Federal government which, taken together or singly, looked ominous. On the following day Beauregard seized the mails as they came from Fort Sumter and discovered a letter from Anderson to the war department which disclosed that he had been informed of the coming of Fox's expedition and indicated that the fleet would attempt to force its way into the harbor. This infor-

<sup>31</sup> Evidently Lincoln did not expect them to retreat, for on April 8 he wrote Governor Curtin of Pennsylvania, one of the recent conferees, "I think the necessity of being *ready* increases. Look to it." From "Lincoln Photostats," Library of Congress; also in Paul M. Angle, *New Letters and Papers of Lincoln* (Boston and New York, 1930), 266. Governor Dennison of Ohio, who was still in Washington, was quoted as promising, on the same date, support to "a vigorous policy." Mt. Vernon (Ohio) *Democratic Banner*, April 16, 1861.

mation also was at once communicated to the Montgomery government. On the tenth came the news that the fleet had sailed from New York. Walker then directed Beauregard, if he thought there was no doubt of the authorized character of the notification from Washington (meaning Lincoln's), to demand the evacuation of Fort Sumter and, if it should be refused, "to reduce" the fort. The Davis administration had waited two full days after receiving word of Lincoln's notification before deciding what to do. It is said that Robert Toombs, secretary of state, objected vigorously to attacking the fort. "It is unnecessary; it puts us in the wrong; it is fatal!"<sup>32</sup> If Toombs protested, he was overruled because Davis and the rest believed that Lincoln had already taken the aggressive and they regarded their problem now as a military one. To them it was the simple question whether they should permit the hostile fleet to arrive before they attacked the fort or whether they should take Sumter before they had to fight both fort and fleet.

At two o'clock on the eleventh Beauregard made the demand upon Anderson, who rejected it but added verbally to the officer sent to him that if not battered to pieces, he would be starved out in a few days. When Beauregard reported this remark to Walker, that official informed him that the government did "not desire needlessly to bombard Fort Sumter" and that if Major Anderson would state when he would evacuate, Beauregard should "avoid the effusion of blood." Evidently the Montgomery officials thought there was still a chance to get the fort peaceably before the fleet could arrive. Had not Lincoln so carefully timed his message with the movement of Fox there might have been no attack. But late in the afternoon of the same day Beauregard received

<sup>32</sup> That Toombs protested against the attack seems to be based wholly upon the statement in Pleasant A. Stovall, *The Life of Robert Toombs* (New York, 1892), 226. Stovall cites no source and U. B. Phillips in his *Life of Robert Toombs* (New York, 1913), 234-35, gives no other citation than Stovall. Richard Lathers attributed the same words to Toombs several days before this crisis arose in a letter which he wrote to the *New York Journal of Commerce* from Montgomery. See Alvan F. Sanborn, *Reminiscences of Richard Lathers* (New York, 1907), 164-65. Nevertheless, that Toombs was greatly concerned over the dangers in the situation is attested by the Confederate secretary of war, L. P. Walker, who quotes Toombs as saying at the cabinet meeting on April 10, "The firing upon that fort will inaugurate a civil war greater than any the world has yet seen; and I do not feel competent to advise you." Crawford, *The Genesis of the Civil War*, 421.

information from a scout boat that the *Harriet Lane*, one of Fox's ships, had been sighted a few miles out of the harbor. It was expected that all the fleet would be at hand by next day. Nevertheless, Beauregard about midnight sent a second message to Anderson, in accordance with Walker's instructions, saying that if he would state the time at which he would evacuate and would agree not to use "your guns against us unless ours should be employed against Fort Sumter, we will abstain from opening fire upon you." To this Anderson replied that he would evacuate by noon on the fifteenth and would in the meantime not open fire upon Beauregard's forces unless compelled to do so by some hostile act "against this fort or the flag it bears, should I not receive prior to that time controlling instructions from my government or additional supplies." This answer was conditional and unsatisfactory for it was clear that, with Fox's fleet arriving, Anderson would not evacuate. Thereupon the two aides who had carried Beauregard's message, in accordance with their instructions from that officer, formally notified Anderson—it was now 3:20 in the morning of the twelfth—that fire would be opened upon him in one hour's time.

What followed we all know. The bombardment which began at 4:30 on the morning of April 12 ended in the surrender of Anderson and his garrison during the afternoon of the following day. The three vessels<sup>33</sup> of the fleet which lay outside were unable to get into the harbor because of the high seas and the failure of the rest of the fleet—the tugboats and the *Powhatan*—to arrive. Although there were no casualties during the bombardment, the mere news that the attack on the fort had begun swept the entire North into a roaring flame of anger. The "rebels" had fired the first shot; they had chosen to begin war. If there had been any doubt earlier whether the mass of the Northern people would support

<sup>33</sup> These were the *Baltic*, the *Harriet Lane*, and the *Pawnee*. The *Pocahontas* did not arrive until the 13th. It is an interesting question whether the Northern reaction would have been different if the Confederates had ignored Fort Sumter and concentrated their efforts upon trying to keep the fleet from entering the harbor. The fact that their chief naval officer, Captain Henry J. Hartstene, reported on April 10 that the Federals would be able to reach the fort in boats at night and that he had no vessels strong enough to prevent the entrance of the fleet may have determined the Confederates to take the fort first. *Official Records*, Ser. I, Vol. I, 299.

the administration in suppressing the secessionists, there was none now. Lincoln's strategy had been completely successful. He seized at once the psychological moment for calling out the militia and committing the North to support of the war. This action cost him four of the border slave states, but he had probably already discounted that loss.

Perhaps the facts thus far enumerated, standing alone, could hardly be conclusive evidence that Lincoln, having decided that there was no other way than war for the salvation of his administration, his party, and the Union, maneuvered the Confederates into firing the first shot in order that they, rather than he, should take the blame of beginning bloodshed. Though subject to that interpretation, they are also subject to the one which he built up so carefully. Is there other evidence? No one, surely, would expect to find in any written word of his a confession of the strategem; for to acknowledge it openly would have been to destroy the very effect he had been at so much pains to produce. There are, it is true, two statements by him to Captain Fox which are at least suggestive. Fox relates that in their conference of April 4 the President told him that he had decided to let the expedition go and that a messenger would be sent to the authorities at Charleston before Fox could possibly get there; and when the Captain reminded the President of the short time in which he must organize the expedition and reach the destined point, Lincoln replied, "You will best fulfill your duty to your country by making the attempt." Then, again, in the letter which Lincoln wrote the chagrined Captain on May 1 to console him for the failure of the fleet to enter Charleston Harbor, he said: "You and I both anticipated that the cause of the country would be advanced by making the attempt to provision Fort Sumter, even if it should fail; and it is no small consolation now to feel that our anticipation is justified by the result."<sup>34</sup> Was this statement merely intended to soothe a disappointed commander, or did it contain a hint that the real objective of the expedition was not at all the relief of Sumter?

<sup>34</sup> Crawford, *Genesis of the Civil War*, 404; Robert Means Thompson and Richard Wainwright (eds.), *Confidential Correspondence of Gustavus Vasa Fox*, 2 vols. (New York, 1918), I, 43-44; Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Lincoln: Works*, II, 41.

Lincoln's two secretaries, John G. Nicolay and John Hay, in their long but not impartial account of the Sumter affair come so close to divulging the essence of the stratagem that one cannot but suspect that they knew of it. In one place they say, with reference to Lincoln's solution of this problem of Sumter, "Abstractly it was enough that the Government was in the right. But to make the issue sure, he determined that in addition the rebellion should be put in the wrong." And again, "President Lincoln in deciding the Sumter question had adopted a simple but effective policy. To use his own words, he determined to 'send bread to Anderson'; if the rebels fired on that, they would not be able to convince the world that he had begun the civil war." And still later, "When he finally gave the order that the fleet should sail he was master of the situation . . . master if the rebels hesitated or repented, because they would thereby forfeit their prestige with the South; master if they persisted, for he would then command a united North."<sup>35</sup>

Perhaps not much weight should be given to the fact that before the expedition reached Charleston his political opponents in the North expressed suspicion of a design to force civil war upon the country in order to save the Republican party from the disasters threatened in the recent elections and that after the fighting began they roundly accused him of having deliberately provoked it by his demonstration against Charleston. And perhaps there is no significance in the further fact that the more aggressive members of his own party had demanded action to save the party and that the administration newspapers began to assert as soon as the fleet sailed that, if war came, the rebels would be the aggressors.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Nicolay and Hay, *Abraham Lincoln*, IV, 33, 44, 62.

<sup>36</sup> Predictions, on the one hand, that the "rebels" would soon start a war and charges, on the other, that, to save the Republican party, Lincoln was demonstrating against Charleston in order to force the Southerners to attack Sumter are to be found in administration and antiadministration papers, respectively, during the week before the fort was fired upon. See, for instance, the Columbus (Ohio) *Crisis*, April 4, 1861; New York *Times*, April 8, 10, 1861; Baltimore *Sun*, April 10, 1861. When the news came of the bombardment at Charleston, the Providence *Daily Post*, April 13, 1861, began an editorial entitled "WHY?" with: "We are to have civil war, if at all, because Abraham Lincoln loves a party better than he loves his country." And after commenting on what seemed to be a sudden change of policy with respect to Sumter, "Why? We think the reader will



There is evidence much more to the point than any of these things. Stephen A. Douglas, senator from Illinois, died on June 3, 1861. On June 12 the Republican governor of that state, Richard Yates, appointed to the vacancy Orville H. Browning, a prominent lawyer, a former Whig, then an ardent Republican, and for more than twenty years a personal friend of Abraham Lincoln. Browning was one of the group who from the first had favored vigorous measures and had opposed compromise. He was to become the spokesman of the administration in the Senate. On July 2, 1861, Browning arrived in Washington to take his seat in the Senate for the special session which had been called to meet on July 4. On the evening of the third he called at the White House to see his old acquaintance. Now Browning for many years had kept a diary, a fact that very probably was unknown to Lincoln since diarists usually conceal this pleasant and useful vice. In the entry for July 3 Browning relates the conversation he had with the President that evening, for after reading the new Senator his special message to Congress, Lincoln laid aside the document and talked. The rest of the entry had best be given in Browning's own words:

He told me that the very first thing placed in his hands after his inauguration was a letter from Majr Anderson announcing the impossibility of defending or relieving Sumter. That he called the cabinet together and consulted Genl Scott—that Scott concurred with Anderson, and the cabinet, with the exception of P M Genl Blair were for evacuating the Fort, and all the troubles and anxieties of his life had not equalled those which intervened between this time and the

perceive why. Mr. Lincoln saw an opportunity to inaugurate civil war without appearing in the character of an aggressor. There are men in Fort Sumter, he said, who are nearly out of provisions. They ought to be fed. We will attempt to feed them. Certainly nobody can blame us for that. . . . The secessionists, who are both mad and foolish, will resist us. They will commence civil war. Then I will appeal to the North to aid me in putting down rebellion, and the North must respond. How can it do otherwise? And sure enough, how can we do otherwise?" A photostatic copy of this editorial was furnished me through the kindness of Professor E. M. Coulter of the University of Georgia.

One story that seems to have had some currency was related by Alexander Long, a Democratic congressman from Ohio, in an antiadministration speech before the House on April 8, 1864, to the effect that when Lincoln first heard the news that the Confederates had opened fire on Fort Sumter, he exclaimed, "I knew they would do it!" *Congressional Globe*, 38 Cong., 1 Sess., 1499 *et seq.* Long's speech aroused much excitement among the Republicans who attempted to expel him from the House on the ground that he was a sympathizer with the rebellion.

fall of Sumter. He himself conceived the idea, and proposed sending supplies, without an attempt to reinforce giving notice of the fact to Gov Pickens of S.C. The plan succeeded. They attacked Sumter—it fell, and thus, did more service than it otherwise could.<sup>87</sup>

This statement, condensed from the words of Lincoln himself by a close friend who wrote them down when he returned that night to his room at “Mrs. Carter’s on Capitol Hill,” needs no elaboration. It completes the evidence.

It is not difficult to understand how the usually secretive Lincoln, so long surrounded by strangers and criticized by many whom he had expected to be helpful, talking that night for the first time in many months to an old, loyal, and discreet friend, though a friend who had often been somewhat patronizing, for once forgot to be reticent. It must have been an emotional relief to him, with his pride over his consummate strategy bottled up within him for so long, to be able to impress his friend Browning with his success in meeting a perplexing and dangerous situation. He did not suspect that Browning would set it down in a diary.

There is little more to be said. Some of us will be content to find new reason for admiration of Abraham Lincoln in reflecting on this bit of masterful strategy at the very beginning of his long struggle for the preservation of the Union. Some, perhaps, will be reminded of the famous incident of the Ems telegram of which the cynical Bismarck boasted in his memoirs. And some will wonder whether the sense of responsibility for the actual beginning of a frightful war, far more terrible than he could possibly have foreseen in that early April of 1861, may have deepened the melancholy and the charity toward his Southern foemen which that strange man in the White House was to reveal so often before that final tragic April of 1865.

<sup>87</sup> Theodore Calvin Pease and James G. Randall (eds.), *The Diary of Orville H. Browning*, 2 vols. (Springfield, Ill., 1927), I, 475-76.

# From Tillman to Long: Some Striking Leaders of the Rural South

By DANIEL M. ROBISON

At intervals since 1890 there have appeared in Southern politics certain striking personalities, whose names have come to symbolize, in the minds of many, a type of leadership that is new to and distinctly of this section.<sup>1</sup> Outstanding among these figures are Ben Tillman and Cole Blease of South Carolina, Tom Watson of Georgia, James K. Vardaman and Theodore G. Bilbo of Mississippi, Jeff Davis of Arkansas, and Huey P. Long of Louisiana. The usual treatment of these men has been to class them as demagogues, and to contrast them with those aristocratic statesmen who represented the South in former times. Their comparison with such men as John C. Calhoun, Wade Hampton, Jefferson Davis, L. Q. C. Lamar, John B. Gordon, and Benjamin H. Hill, to say nothing of the giants of the Old Dominion, has led to the frequent conclusion that Southern political standards and leadership have deteriorated.<sup>2</sup>

Observers have attributed this phenomenon to the ignorance of the people, to the one-party system, to the effects of Populism, to the direct primary, or to corrupt politics. Undoubtedly each explanation holds

<sup>1</sup> Revised draft of a paper read before the American Historical Association, Chattanooga, December 30, 1935.

<sup>2</sup> A typical statement of this contrast is made by Ray Stannard Baker, "The Negro in Politics," in *American Magazine* (New York, 1876-), LXVI (1908), 169-73. See also John M. Mecklin, "Vardamanism," in *Independent* (New York, 1848-1928), LXXI (1911), 461-63; Gerald W. Johnson, "Live Demagogues or Dead Gentlemen," in *Virginia Quarterly Review* (Charlottesville, 1925-), XII (1936), 1-14. The usual statement of the idea is contained in "Why Blease Won," in *Literary Digest* (New York, 1890-), XLV (1912), 410. The political dictatorship of the planter aristocracy in the Old South is accepted by John D. Hicks, *The Populist Revolt* (Minneapolis, 1931), 36-37.

an element of truth. Yet before accepting at face value this condemnation of modern Southern leadership and, inferentially, of the Southern electorate, it is necessary to examine the comparison upon which the conclusion largely rests. Aristocratic statesmanship represents the old; demagoguery represents the new.

As a matter of fact, the aristocracy never dominated politics in the Lower South, with the possible exception of South Carolina. This myth seems to be the product of several factors, chief among which may be mentioned: failure to recognize sufficiently the frontier character of the Lower South before 1860; the tendency of postwar Southerners to glorify the "good old days," when their representatives held a more commanding influence in national affairs; and, perhaps most important of all, the effect of antislavery propaganda, designed to alienate the democratic West from the slaveholding South, and preserved by historians of that school. The aristocratic legend is shattered, however, by a glance at the biographical sketches of those who held high office in the cotton South between 1828 and 1860, and from the end of reconstruction to 1900. Not more than a third of the governors, United States senators, and congressmen during these periods came from the slaveholding aristocracy. An overwhelming majority rose from the middle class, quite as happened in other sections.<sup>3</sup> The legend is further discredited by the fact that the Whig party, to which the planter aristocrats tended to belong, never dominated politics in the Lower South. Likewise unsupportable is the idea that, prior to 1860, the section was ruled by an oligarchy, aristocratic, slaveholding, or otherwise. From 1828 to 1860 the average tenure of the United States senators from these states was less than six years; that of the congressmen was slightly

<sup>3</sup> See the *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927* (Washington, 1928), and *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. (New York, 1928-1936), for biographical sketches of some 550 governors, senators, and congressmen from the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina. Sketches of 27 governors were not found. It is thought, however, that these would not change the conclusion. Due recognition is given to the difficulty of drawing an exact line between aristocracy and nonaristocracy in America. Professor Kendrick has held that the cotton South had not developed an aristocracy by 1860. See Benjamin B. Kendrick, "Agrarian Discontent in the South: 1880-1890," in American Historical Association, *Report*, 1920, pp. 265-72.

more than four; and that of the governors was scarcely three years.<sup>4</sup> These figures seem to indicate a turnover in public office that contradicts the nature of an oligarchy, and that is more in keeping with a genuine democracy.

The older Southern leadership was not only aristocratic, according to the comparison under consideration, but the term statesmanlike is applied liberally. Reluctant though one may be to detract from the fame of that leadership, one cannot ignore the universal tendency to make dead politicians into statesmen. It takes but a cursory reading of American history and its source material to understand how far short of statesmanship were the vast majority of officeholders and office seekers in the eyes of their contemporaries. The uncomplimentary estimates of Southern political leaders, held by antislavery opinion, must be discounted, but many Southerners of the period were most realistic in their comments upon those who guided the political affairs of their section. Southern commentators, whether of the war period or of modern times, have dealt rather severely with the statesmanship of President Jefferson Davis, the members of his cabinet, and with those who made up the Confederate Congress, to say nothing of some of the governors and lesser political lights of the states of the Confederacy.<sup>5</sup> All of which is not to deny that politics, in the Old South, tended to attract the more alert and ambitious to a degree not equalled either in the North or in the New South. However, the assumption that aristocracy and statesmanship were the marked characteristics of Southern political leaders prior to 1890 must be accepted with reservations.

The further assumption that men of the Tillman-Long type were demagogues likewise calls for consideration. Without acquitting them completely of this charge, we may well question whether the estimates of their political opponents can be taken for the final judgment of

<sup>4</sup> The tenure of senators and representatives is obtained from the *Biographical Directory of the American Congress*. For that of governors of the various states, see the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Cambridge, Eng., 1910-1911).

<sup>5</sup> Those who are inclined to idealize the "statesmen" of the Old South will do well to read J. B. Jones, *A Rebel War Clerk's Diary at the Confederate States Capital*, edited by Howard Swiggett, 2 vols. (New York, 1935).

history. It seems only necessary to give additional thought to the men themselves, to the policies and measures for which they stood, and to the conditions which produced them. General as this consideration must be, there will appear certain common factors contributing to their careers; factors that are by no means magic formulae to produce a perfect solution, but which do help to arrive at a sane interpretation of the men and of their significance in Southern politics.

The first requirement to an understanding of these new spokesmen of the rural South is a recognition of the changed status of the farmer in this section, and the consequent changed status of those who sponsored his interests. Although the industrial order had made beginnings in the Old South, agriculture had dominated the section, and had commanded the support of a great majority, including planters, farmers, lawyers, editors, and clergymen. Such a state of affairs helped to produce a unity of public opinion, in the formation of which slavery and planter-aristocratic domination have been stressed too greatly. The difference in interests between the large planter and small farmer was largely one of degree. Both wanted high prices for the products of the land and low prices for the services of capital and industry. In other words, both were committed to those policies that were favorable to the agricultural economy.<sup>6</sup> Quite naturally this harmony of interest made the planter and his class fitting leaders for the small farmer, and contributed to the idea that the section was ruled by a planter oligarchy.

A number of writers have discussed the breakup of the plantation system, the increase of tenantry, and the growth of industry in the New South:<sup>7</sup> developments that were concurrent with agricultural depressions

<sup>6</sup> James Truslow Adams has noted the community of interest between the great planter and small farmer of the South, even in colonial times, and has contrasted this with the conflicting interests of the wealthy mercantile classes and the poorer farmers of the North. It would seem, however, that in explaining this condition in the South, Mr. Adams has overemphasized the influence of debt, and has tended to overlook the fact that the interests of the planter and farmer were largely identical except for degree. James Truslow Adams, *Provincial Society, 1690-1763* (New York, 1927), 220-21. For a clear statement of the unanimity of Southern interests, see Alex M. Arnett, *The Populist Movement in Georgia*, in Columbia University *Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*, CIV, No. 1 (New York, 1922), 19.

<sup>7</sup> Broadus Mitchell and George Sinclair Mitchell, *The Industrial Revolution in the*

throughout the country. The census figures for the years 1880 and 1890 reveal unmistakably the rate at which industrialism was increasing, as compared to agricultural interests. While it is true that the total valuation of farm lands, as well as that of farm buildings, equipment, and live stock increased during the decade, the rate of increase was negligible as compared to that invested in industrial activities. In the seven states of the deep South, in which states the Tillman-Long group appeared, the increase in agricultural valuations for the decade mentioned was 47 per cent, as compared with an increase of 227 per cent in the capital invested in manufactures, to say nothing of that put into railroads, mining, and urban properties. More significant, perhaps, was the rate of increase in the value of the products of farm and factory. That of the farms was 22 per cent, while that of the factories was 143 per cent. Most significant of all is the fact that each dollar invested in agriculture yielded a gross total in products of \$0.41, while the same dollar invested in manufacturing produced a gross total of \$1.29.<sup>8</sup>

*South* (Baltimore, 1930); Broadus Mitchell, "Two Industrial Revolutions," in *South Atlantic Quarterly* (Durham, 1902-), XX (1921), 287-303, and "A Survey of Industry," in H. T. Couch (ed.), *Culture in the South* (Chapel Hill, 1934), 82-89; George Fort Milton, "Also There is Politics," in *ibid.*, 116, 120; William B. Hesseltine, "Economic Factors in the Abandonment of Reconstruction," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1915-), XXII (1935), 191-210, and "Tennessee's Invitation to Carpet-Baggers," in *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications*, No. 4 (1932), 102 ff.; Holland Thompson, *The New South* (New Haven, 1921), 86-105, 193-97, and "The New South, Economic and Social," in *Studies in Southern History and Politics* inscribed to William A. Dunning (New York, 1914), 291-315; Hicks, *Populist Revolt*, 37-38; Francis B. Simkins, "The Solution of the Post-bellum Agricultural Problems in South Carolina," in *North Carolina Historical Review* (Raleigh, 1904-), VII (1930), 192-219; Robert P. Brooks, *Agrarian Revolution in Georgia, 1865-1912* (Madison, Wis., 1914), 41; M. B. Hammond, "The Southern Farmer and the Cotton Question," in *Political Science Quarterly* (Boston, New York, 1886-), XII (1897), 457-59; and Henry W. Grady, "Cotton and Its Kingdom," in *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* (New York, 1850-), LXIII (1881), 721-22. A recent and most suggestive discussion of the industrialization of the South may be found in Benjamin B. Kendrick and Alex M. Arnett, *The South Looks at Its Past* (Chapel Hill, 1935), 105-41.

<sup>8</sup> *Compendium of the Eleventh Census: 1890*, Pt. III (Washington, 1897), 614-17, 670-71. The states included are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina. It was impossible to obtain a satisfactory comparison for the decade 1870-1880. In the words of the Superintendent of Census, the figures on manufacturing for the census of 1870 are entirely unreliable and misleading.

Rather than wage a disheartening war for the interests of agriculture under such conditions, the more alert and ambitious turned to the towns and cities, a movement that was by no means confined to the Southern states. To those who made this change, planting became secondary to merchandising, moneylending, railroad promotion, factory building, and the development of resources.<sup>9</sup> Thus there evolved a real divergence between the economic interests of farm and town, that was to affect greatly the political and social scene. No longer the most profitable, farming could not remain the most honorable occupation; and the bar, press, pulpit, and political party soon reflected this altered state of affairs. The unanimity with which the spokesmen of the people had championed the cause of agriculture was no more. There began that steady conquest of the Democratic party, on the part of the new industrialists, that was to make for the conservatism of that party in the South. The extent to which the "Bourbons" of the New South had gained the ascendancy in Georgia has been adequately described by Professor Arnett.<sup>10</sup> Although this ascendancy may have varied in degree in other Southern states, the trend was general and unmistakable.<sup>11</sup>

Under such circumstances, the "dirt farmers" of the South came to understand that they had lost their former spokesmen, not only at Washington but at the state capitals and county seats as well. Their distresses during the agricultural depressions impressed upon them the need for new leaders, and made them resentful of those whom they had

<sup>9</sup> Hicks, *Populist Revolt*, 51-52; Paul Lewinson, "The Negro in the White Class and Party Struggle," in *Southwestern Political and Social Science Quarterly* (Austin, Norman, 1920-), VIII (1928), 358-82; John D. Allen, "Journalism in the South," in H. T. Couch (ed.), *Culture in the South*, 135-48; Hamilton Basso, "Huey Long and His Background," in *Harper's Magazine*, CLXX (1935), 663-73. The case is well put by A Public Man of Georgia, "Why Frank was Lynched," in *Forum* (New York, 1886-), LVI (1916), 677-92. See, also, Kendrick and Arnett, *The South Looks at Its Past*.

<sup>10</sup> Arnett, *Populist Movement in Georgia*, 23-26, 29-32, 39-40, 47, 53. Professor Arnett declares that all the governors elected in Georgia between 1872 and 1890, except Alexander H. Stephens, were allied with the new industrialism. The same thing, he says, is true of the congressmen and members of the legislature. Robert Toombs and Stephens, says Arnett, attempted to carry out the traditional ante-bellum leadership, but lost their dominant places in the party.

<sup>11</sup> Ben Tillman expressed this fact in respect to South Carolina in his first inaugural address, quoted by Basso, "Huey Long and His Background," *loc. cit.*, 668; *South Carolina House Journal*, 1890, pp. 130-54. See, also, *ibid.*, 1894, p. 19.



formerly trusted. Resentment against the state "machine" or the "court house rings," as well as against the plight of the rural inhabitants, largely animated such men as Alexander H. Stephens, Dr. William Felton, and Emory Speer in their earlier revolts in Georgia. Elsewhere, as in that state, these earlier efforts of the dissatisfied farmers were rendered futile by superior political organization and by that party regularity growing out of the race question.<sup>12</sup>

Such were the conditions attending the rise of the Tillman-Long type of leadership. A glance at the family background of those who have been included in the group shows that they were of the middle class, which had supplied the section with a majority of its leaders in former times. Ben Tillman's family owned considerable land, and he, in his own right, was a successful farmer before he entered politics. Nor was land the only inheritance received by Tillman from his family. An uncle, John Tillman, who is described as a man of strong intellectual qualities, left him a large library of the best English literature. Perhaps there may be a bit of the romantic in that picture of Tillman spending a good part of each day "lying on the piazza floor reading French history and *Paradise Lost*,"<sup>13</sup> but there can be no question as to his strong interest in books as well as in farming.<sup>14</sup>

Tom Watson's biographer describes the Watson family as of the landowning and slaveholding gentry, and the mother of Tom as an "intellectual for her time."<sup>15</sup> Without trying to pass on the gentility of the Watson family, we do know that Watson had the gentleman's love of the land, and that one of his first acts after beginning the practice of law was to buy the family homestead. From that time until the end of his life, Hickory Hill was to him what Mount Vernon was to Washing-

<sup>12</sup> Arnett, *Populist Movement in Georgia*, 34-35; Thompson, *The New South*, 35-37.

<sup>13</sup> Zach McGhee, "Tillman, Smasher of Traditions," in *World's Work* (New York, 1900-1932), XII (1906), 8014.

<sup>14</sup> Francis Butler Simkins, *The Tillman Movement in South Carolina* (Durham, 1926); editorial comment, in *Harper's Weekly* (New York, 1857-1916), XLV (1901), 590; A Washington Journalist, in *Independent*, LXI (1906), 1430.

<sup>15</sup> William W. Brewton, *The Life of Thomas E. Watson* (Atlanta, 1926), 6. See, also, Watson's story of his own life, in Thomas E. Watson, *Life and Speeches of Thomas E. Watson* (Thomson, Ga., 1911), 9-22.

ton, Monticello to Jefferson, or the Hermitage to Andrew Jackson. Nor would it be surprising, in view of Watson's attainments in the field of letters, if his mother possessed unusual qualities of mind. His *Life of Thomas Jefferson*, his *Story of France*, or his *Napoleon* may not be indispensable to modern historical scholarship, but they were widely read and were favorably reviewed in the periodicals of the day.<sup>16</sup>

Jeff Davis of Arkansas probably had as little of personal attraction as any of the group under consideration. Yet Davis was the son of a Baptist minister, who "subsequently became a practicing lawyer of respectable attainments." Jeff Davis married, the first time, the daughter of a Methodist minister, and his second wife was "a member of one of the oldest and most respected families of western Arkansas."<sup>17</sup> In his younger days, Davis attended the University of Arkansas and the law schools of Vanderbilt and Cumberland universities.<sup>18</sup>

Without going into the family background of others of the Tillman-Long group, it is well to remember that Long attended the University of Oklahoma and the law school of Tulane University; Bilbo attended Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, and the University of Michigan;<sup>19</sup> Blease was a student at Newberry College, and later graduated from the law school of Georgetown University at Washington.<sup>20</sup> Enough has been said to suggest that these so-called demagogues compare favorably with the average public man in the United States in respect to family background, educational training, and intellectual attainments. Whatever may be said of their political views or of their

<sup>16</sup> Typical reviews of Watson's historical writings may be found in *Arena* (Boston, 1889-1909), XXXI (1904), 325-29; *Athenaeum* (London, 1828-1921), May 3, 1902, p. 562; *Bookman* (New York, 1895-), XXXII (1910), 219; *Dial* (Chicago, New York, 1880-), XXVII (1900), 116-17; XXXVI (1904), 262-63. John Donald Wade, "Jefferson, New Style," in *American Mercury* (New York, 1924-), XVIII (1929), 293-301, discusses Watson's writings with more tolerance than he does Watson's career and political principles.

<sup>17</sup> Senator James P. Clarke of Arkansas, *Memorial Addresses*, in *Senate Documents*, 62 Cong., 3 Sess., XXIII, No. 1146.

<sup>18</sup> David Y. Thomas, "Jeff Davis," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, V, 122-23; *Biographical Directory of the American Congress*, 885; L. S. Dunaway, *Jeff Davis, Governor and United States Senator* (Little Rock, 1913).

<sup>19</sup> *Congressional Directory*, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 56.

<sup>20</sup> *Biographical Directory of the American Congress*, *passim*.

following, these men were not ignorant, nor did they come from the lowest strata of Southern society.

Perhaps the most generally recognized characteristic common to the members of this group is the vividness of their campaign methods, a vividness that lends itself easily to the charge of demagoguery. They frequently resorted to intemperate language and to those "tricks of the trade" which are likely to appeal to the unthinking portion of the electorate. They appealed to the poor as against the rich, to the "common" man as against the aristocrat, to the farmer as against the townsman.<sup>21</sup> Such campaign methods were inevitable, however, for the reason that these men faced opposition from the Democratic organizations, the press, the bar, and the more prominent of the clergy.<sup>22</sup> They battled against those agencies which are most effective in molding public opinion, and which formerly had supported the agricultural interests. Under such circumstances, they were compelled to gain their publicity by individual effort, and by appeals that would be heard above the many powerful voices supporting the conservatives. When Dr. C. P. DeVore, a planter and close friend of Tillman, asked the latter why he raised "so much hell" in his campaigns, Tillman replied: "Well, . . . if I didn't the damn fools wouldn't vote for me."<sup>23</sup> Whether such campaign methods are in truth demagogic, or whether they make up what is called showmanship, they are not uncommon in American politics. They seem to be necessary to the success of anyone who happens to oppose

<sup>21</sup> A characteristic indictment of such campaign methods may be found in the *Arkansas Gazette*, August 1, 1906, quoted in Dunaway, *Jeff Davis*, 208-26. See, also, sketch on Jeff Davis in the *Dictionary of American Biography*, V, 122-23. For comments on the methods of some other members of the group, see Wade, "Jefferson, New Style," *loc. cit.*, 298; Simkins, *Tillman Movement*, 124, 129; editorial comment, in *Current Literature* (New York, 1888-1925), XLI (1906), 154; Webster Smith, *The Kingfish, A Biography of Huey P. Long* (New York, 1933), 30-31; Hodding Carter and Gerald L. K. Smith, "How Come Huey Long," in *New Republic* (New York, 1914-), LXXXII (1935), 14; Basso, "Huey Long," *loc. cit.*, 670.

<sup>22</sup> Newspaper opposition to Long is well remembered. The cases of Long, Davis, and Blease may be taken as typical. See editorial, "Impeachment Proceedings in Louisiana," in *New Republic*, LVIII (1929), 268-69; "South Carolina Rejects Blease," in *Literary Digest*, XLIX (1914), 448; O. L. Warr, "Mr. Blease of South Carolina," in *American Mercury*, XVI (1929), 25-32.

<sup>23</sup> Simkins, *Tillman Movement*, 169, n. 14.

"the powers that be." In fact, the term demagogue itself is not absolute, and political opponents have applied it liberally to many who now hold respected places in the history of American public life. And what is the measure of a demagogue? One likes to speculate, for example, whether the charge of demagoguery can be applied to the "cross of gold" and not to the "full dinner pail"; whether it is applicable to "the forgotten man" and not to the "chicken in every pot." Whether one is to be classed as a demagogue or a statesman seems to depend quite often upon the respectability of his followers and upon the agencies of propaganda which support or oppose him.

These modern spokesmen of the rural South have been accepted as demagogues, largely because of their campaign methods. It is misleading, however, to judge them solely on this basis. The candidate spends a few months campaigning. If successful, he spends from two to six years in office. No satisfactory estimate of a man can be based upon the former to the neglect of the latter. It may be worth while, therefore, to look briefly at the official records of some of these Southern "demagogues."

When Ben Tillman became governor, he confronted the questions of whether the state should regulate the railroads; whether the property of the railroads and other corporations should be valued for taxation at figures more in line with other forms of property; and whether the influence of the roads with the political agencies of the state should not be lessened. The measures that South Carolina adopted, under Tillman's guidance, seem mild enough today. They were: the creation of a railroad commission, a revision of the tax laws, and a law prohibiting free passes. Tillman attacked the liquor question, and the result was the institution of his famous dispensary system. The plan did not work satisfactorily and was repealed in later years. However, in view of the failure of much subsequent liquor legislation in the United States and of the apparent success of the dispensary system in other countries, one hesitates to condemn this pioneer for his lack of success on so difficult an issue. Tillman's name is inseparably connected with Clemson and Winthrop colleges, and, in the words of Ray Stannard Baker, "he per-

formed a notable service in extending popular education." Other laws of the Tillman era sought to modify the crop mortgage system to the benefit of the debtor class, to limit the hours of labor in cotton mills, and to insure against the sale of impure fertilizers as well as to break up what he termed the phosphate monopoly in the state, and he re-funded the state debt to effect a yearly saving in interest. Such are some of the constructive accomplishments of Tillman the governor.<sup>24</sup> His record in the United States Senate, though not brilliant, was creditable. In 1906 President Theodore Roosevelt, in sponsoring the Hepburn bill, was opposed by Republican "stalwarts" in the Senate. It fell to Tillman's lot to lead the fight for the bill in the upper house, and this he did successfully.<sup>25</sup> It may have been this support of the Roosevelt measure that influenced a political correspondent of the *Independent* to say about this "demagogue" from South Carolina: "Within his intellectual limits—and they are by no means contracted—he is a clean, broad, potent statesman. There have been bigger men in the Senate, but few of Tillman's honesty of purpose and indomitable courage. . . . and South Carolina does well by her sisters when she sends Ben Tillman to the front."<sup>26</sup> Several years before this a leading magazine of the East had commented editorially to the effect that Tillman was a widely read and well-informed man "as honest as the day, as sincere as a man can be in politics."<sup>27</sup>

It is possible that one of the keys to Vardaman's rise to the governorship of Mississippi may be found in the inaugural addresses and messages of his predecessor. Governor Andrew H. Longino, in 1900, expressed the hope that "'no more sentimental or prejudiced opposition

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 99-100, 105, 138, 149-50, 174-75, 183; *Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia* (New York, 1862-1903), N.S., XVI (1891), 798; XVII (1892), 703-706; Ray Stannard Baker, "The Negro in Politics," in *American Magazine*, LXVI (1908), 173. Tillman's own summary of the accomplishments of his administrations is found in the Governor's Message, *South Carolina House Journal*, 1894, p. 20. For his criticisms of the old order as well as the outline of his own program, see "Inaugural Address," *ibid.*, 1890, pp. 130-54; "Governor's Message," *ibid.*, 1891, pp. 28-60; Simkins, *Tillman Movement*, 57 et seq.

<sup>25</sup> *World's Work*, XII (1906), 7486.

<sup>26</sup> A Washington Journalist, "Men We are Watching," in *Independent*, LXI (1906), 1429-30.

<sup>27</sup> *Harper's Weekly*, XLV (1901), 590.

to railroads or other corporate enterprises will find favor with the legislature, so that capital hunting investment will have no just cause to pass Mississippi.' ” Two years later he congratulated that body on the fact that “ ‘There exists . . . a becoming liberality of sentiment by the masses toward corporate and other investments of money in our midst.’ ”<sup>28</sup> This “becoming liberality” towards corporate investments had found expression in an act of the legislature in 1882 exempting new railroads and manufactures from taxation for a period of ten years.<sup>29</sup> A similar act, applying to new manufactures, was passed in 1896.<sup>30</sup> Such liberality toward corporate enterprise had been paralleled by a series of deficits in the operating expenses of the state government,<sup>31</sup> particularly from the years 1892 to 1896 inclusive. To add to the unsatisfactory condition of Mississippi’s finances, the state treasurer, in 1890, was tried and convicted for embezzlement of state funds. This embezzlement seems to have occurred over a period of fourteen years, and the amount lost to the state was considerably in excess of three hundred thousand dollars.<sup>32</sup> In 1901 another shortage of a hundred thousand dollars was found in the same office.<sup>33</sup> The editor of the *Cosmopolitan Magazine* may have resorted to exaggeration in his introduction to an article by George Creel called “The Carnival of Corruption in Mississippi,” but he declared: “For years the great state of Mississippi has been under the vicious ban of political and legislative corruption. The ‘interests’—the Lumber Trust, Oil-Mill Trust, and the rest—have had their will. They have bribed the Legislature, selected their own representatives in state and Congress, [and] debauched the government.”<sup>34</sup> Creel concluded that Vardaman “gave Mississippi the best administration in its history.” Vardaman, he declared, had eliminated graft and inefficiency; had made the state institutions models of their kind; had stopped

<sup>28</sup> Dunbar Rowland, *History of Mississippi*, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1925), II, 280, 296.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 224.

<sup>30</sup> *Annual Cyclopaedia*, 3rd Ser., I (1896), 492.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, N.S., XVIII (1893), 498; XX (1895), 495-96; *ibid.*, 3rd Ser., II (1897), 532.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, N.S., XV (1890), 559.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 3rd Ser., VII (1902), 751-52; Rowland, *History of Mississippi*, II, 295.

<sup>34</sup> *Cosmopolitan Magazine* (New York, 1886-1925), LI (1911), 725.

"interest-grabbing" on state, county, and levee board funds; he had stopped the farming out of convicts and jail prisoners to favored politicians and had put them on state farms, which had shown net cash earnings of a half million dollars in four years; he had stopped lynching in the state; and at the same time, "he fought, tooth and nail, the trusts and combines that were striving to gobble up the state's resources."<sup>85</sup> Ray Stannard Baker was more moderate in his praise when he said: "In spite of the bitterness against Vardaman among some of the best people of Mississippi I heard no one accuse him of corruption in any department of his administration. On the whole, they said he had directed the business of the state with judgment."<sup>86</sup> Vardaman's administration saw the enactment of a number of laws looking toward the regulation of insurance companies, railroads, utilities, banks, manufactures, and trusts for the better protection of the public interest.<sup>87</sup> Other acts provided for: the erection of an institution for the deaf and dumb; the establishment of agricultural experiment stations; the creation of a textbook commission and the adoption of uniform textbooks; a Jim Crow law; the codification of the laws; the erection of hospital buildings at the state's institution for the insane; a survey of the state's resources; and the creation of a department of agriculture and commerce.<sup>88</sup>

Obviously it would be difficult to form a correct estimate of the official records of Theodore G. Bilbo and Huey P. Long at this time. Bilbo's career in the United States Senate is in its early stages, and his record as governor is associated, in the minds of many, with his treatment of university and college faculties in his state. Without defending him on this score, this episode tends to obscure the fact that the Bilbo administrations saw marked increase in the physical equipment of those institutions. During his first administration, the cause of public education was furthered by the creation of a commission to eradicate adult

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 725-35.

<sup>86</sup> Baker, "The Negro in Politics," *loc. cit.*, 172-73.

<sup>87</sup> State of Mississippi, *Laws*, 1904, chaps. LXXVI, LXXIX, LXXX, LXXXI, CIV, CXI, CXXVI, CLXXXII; 1906, chaps. CVII, CXL.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 1904, chaps. XV, LXXXIV, LXXXV, LXXXVI, XCIX, C; 1906, chaps. XIII, XXXIV, CXI, CII, CIII.

illiteracy, by attempts to prevent excess prices on textbooks, by a provision for transportation to rural consolidated schools, and by the enactment of a compulsory school law.<sup>39</sup> He sponsored a program for the building of hospitals and other institutions for the subnormal and underprivileged.<sup>40</sup> A series of laws were passed dealing with corporations, the sale of corporate stocks, the problem of public utilities, and the activities of insurance companies.<sup>41</sup> Other laws passed during the first Bilbo administration sought to deal with such subjects as the protection of game and fish, temperance, the evils of lobbying, tick eradication, the prohibition of public hangings, estate and inheritance taxes, and eradication of tuberculosis among cattle.<sup>42</sup> During his second term as governor, Bilbo encountered effective political opposition within the legislature, with the consequent defeat of a number of his proposals. Among the things which he advocated however, were: a bureau of markets for agricultural products, an improved highway system, a sales tax, and a reorganization of the state government along modern lines.<sup>43</sup>

The constructive record of Huey Long in Louisiana cannot yet be disassociated in the public mind from his spectacular political methods. Among the things that his regime accomplished in that state, however, may be mentioned: an increase of the severance tax, along with the abolishment of the poll tax and the state levy against small homes and farms; a reduction in utility rates; the construction of an excellent highway and free-bridge system; and the modernization of the state's institutions. Long's interest in the Louisiana State University and his development of that institution are widely recognized. Less known is his responsibility for free textbooks in the public schools, school busses, night schools for adults, and for traveling libraries. With all this, the

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 1916, chaps. CX, CLXXIX, CLXXX; 1918, chap. CCLVIII.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 1916, chaps. I, LXVII, LXVIII, CVIII, CXLIII.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, chaps. XCII, XCV, XCVII, CXLVIII, CC, CCI, CCII, CCIII, CCIV, CCV, CCVI.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, chaps. XCIX, CIII, CIV, CV, CLXVII, CCXVIII; 1918, chaps. CIX, CCXV.

<sup>43</sup> Clip files of the *Memphis Commercial Appeal* and *Memphis Press Scimitar*. The following administration instituted the sales tax, and received considerable applause for the resulting improvement in the state's financial condition. The present administration is effecting the long-needed improvement of the highway system.



tax rate for Louisiana is not excessive, and his levies against special forms of wealth have not driven capital from the state.<sup>44</sup> If one may judge by the trend of affairs in Louisiana since Long's death, his policies were not displeasing to the voters of that state. His record in national affairs is overshadowed by his activities in Louisiana politics, by his "share the wealth" program, and by his bitter opposition to the Roosevelt administration. It seems too early to pass mature judgment on that record. This phenomenon, however, is most interesting: although Long's program appeared far more radical than those of any of the so-called Southern demagogues, his political "respectability" increased in the eyes of many conservative commentators in direct proportion to his prospects of wrecking the Roosevelt administration.

Jeff Davis of Arkansas seems to have acquired his reputation for demagoguery after he became attorney general of his state, and after he had begun vigorous action to enforce the antitrust law. In so doing, he instituted some 225 suits against the fire insurance companies operating in the state, as well as against the Standard Oil Company, the American Tobacco Company, the Continental Tobacco Company, the "Cotton Seed Oil Trust," and the express companies.<sup>45</sup> As governor he continued his efforts to bring the insurance companies, life as well as fire, under such restrictions as he believed for the protection of policyholders and public. As a result, the years 1901 to 1905 saw the passage of nine acts designed to accomplish this purpose.<sup>46</sup> It should be remembered that while Davis was thus enhancing his reputation for demagoguery, Charles Evans Hughes was about to gain fame through his exposures of insurance methods in New York. The Davis regime saw

<sup>44</sup> Carter and Smith, "How Come Huey Long," *loc. cit.*, 14-15; F. Raymond Daniell, "The Gentleman from Louisiana," in *Current History* (New York, 1914-), XLI (1934), 172, 175-76; *Business Week* (New York, 1929-), February 9, 1935, pp. 12-13. The Houston (Texas) *Post-Dispatch* is quoted in the *Literary Digest*, CXII (1932), February 6, p. 7, as declaring that Long "is deserving of credit for breaking the shell that had encrusted Louisiana in backwardness and conservatism, and in modernizing the state." Mention of some of the more important enactments of the Long regime may be found in articles on "Louisiana," in *New International Year Book* (New York, 1928-1935).

<sup>45</sup> *Annual Cyclopaedia*, 3rd Ser., V (1900), 35; Dunaway, *Jeff Davis*, 54.

<sup>46</sup> Arkansas General Assembly, *Acts*, 1901, Nos. 39, 46, 115, 181; 1903, Nos. 105, 111; 1905, Nos. 192, 324, 327.

also the passage of a series of acts, intended either to break the powers of the trusts and other corporations or to protect the public against excessive rates and other abuses of the period.<sup>47</sup> And many of these laws were passed at a time when Theodore Roosevelt was establishing his reputation as a "trust buster." Arkansas, under Davis' leadership, sought to protect and better the lot of the laboring classes. Laws were passed attacking the "script" evil, prohibiting child labor in factories, limiting hours of adult labor in certain types of work, protecting miners against unfair weighing methods, prohibiting the blacklisting of employees, and seeking to redress other grievances of labor.<sup>48</sup> Other acts passed during the Davis regime sought to raise the level of public education by authorizing the establishment of libraries, prohibiting nepotism in the employment of teachers, establishing graded courses of study for the common schools, and by raising the standards of the teaching profession.<sup>49</sup> Still other acts sought to protect the public against false bank statements and the acceptance of money by banks known to be insolvent, and against impure food, false weights and measures, and untruthful advertising.<sup>50</sup>

Tom Watson held no executive position, but as a member of the lower house of the Fifty-second Congress (1891-1893), he stood for those measures believed by the Populists to be for the best interests of the farming groups. He introduced, among others, bills and resolutions calling for an income tax, a discontinuance of national banks as well as the further issuance of United States bonds, the establishment of the subtreasury system, and an increase in the currency.<sup>51</sup> As a member of the Georgia legislature he exerted himself, "ineffectively" it is true, in the interest of Confederate veterans, temperance, tenant farmers, and leased convicts.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 1901, Nos. 23, 216; 1903, Nos. 68, 156, 183; 1905, Nos. 1, 88, 250, 282.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 1901, Nos. 101, 114, 161; 1903, Nos. 4, 127, 144; 1905, Nos. 49, 143, 214, 219, 233, 309.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 1901, Nos. 26, 205; 1903, Nos. 52, 93, 137; 1905, No. 311.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 1901, Nos. 7, 77, 113; 1905, Nos. 121, 272.

<sup>51</sup> *Congressional Record*, 52 Cong., 1 Sess., *passim* (1891-1892); 2 Sess., *passim* (1892-1893).

<sup>52</sup> Wade, "Jefferson, New Style," *loc. cit.*, 293-301.

These brief sketches of efforts and accomplishments do not establish members of the Tillman-Long group as great statesmen. They do show, however, that contrary to the opinion expressed by William Allen White and held in many other quarters, the great mass of voters who supported them was not a "moronic underworld."<sup>53</sup> Among the measures which they advocated and effected are many which were in line with the liberal thought of the times, and which have been accepted for years as sound public policy. It would seem that such records in office must temper the charge of demagoguery.

One of the most apparent factors which were common to this new leadership of the rural South was a hostility to large corporate and financial power. Long denounced concentrated national wealth as well as the oil companies and utilities of Louisiana. Tillman deplored "the abject surrender of our statesmen to the power of corporate money and class interest."<sup>54</sup> Blease called upon South Carolina to renounce the new industrialism, "'if we have to buy capital by murdering women and children.'"<sup>55</sup> Watson espoused the cause of Populism, inveighed against the trusts, and asserted that the Free List was the only Big Stick that would club the "malefactors of great wealth" into submission.<sup>56</sup> Jeff Davis denounced the railroad lobby, speculators in farm products, the protective tariff, and he disregarded party lines to defend Theodore Roosevelt's antitrust message.<sup>57</sup> The immediate objects of their hostility varied with the decades, but they fought those great interests of an industrial age which, they held, threatened the well-being of their rural South. More frequently than not, they were in accord with the Western agrarians on questions of currency, railroad and utility regulation, and monopoly control.<sup>58</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Frank R. Kent, "Our Political Monstrosities," in *Atlantic Monthly*, CLI (1933), 407-11.

<sup>54</sup> Basso, "Huey Long," *loc. cit.*, 668.

<sup>55</sup> Simkins, *Tillman Movement*, 177.

<sup>56</sup> Thomas E. Watson, "The People's Party's Appeal," in *Independent*, LXV (1908), 882-86.

<sup>57</sup> *Cong. Record*, 60 Cong., 1 Sess., 272-85 (December 11, 1907), 5521-31 (May 1, 1908); 2 Sess., 1402 ff. (January 26, 1909); 61 Cong., 1 Sess., 3845 ff. (June 26, 1901).

<sup>58</sup> This opposition to concentrated wealth and economic power so permeates the campaign speeches, congressional addresses, and state papers of members of the Tillman-Long group that a detailed citation of them would be both tedious and superfluous.

It is interesting, too, that a majority of the Tillman-Long group fought the national Democratic administrations of their day on important issues. Long's attacks upon the New Deal were occasioned by President Roosevelt's failure to go far enough to the left. Cleveland's conservatism called forth Ben Tillman's famous pitchfork threat, and drove Tom Watson into the Populist party. President Wilson's War and League policies met bitter opposition at the hands of Vardaman, Blease, and Watson. Bilbo's promise to "out-Huey Huey" caused his election to the Senate to be interpreted as a protest against Roosevelt's conservatism. This hostility to the Democratic national leadership suggests the similar attitude that the Western progressives have maintained toward Republican administrations. The suggestion is all the more significant when it is remembered that these Southerners, like the Westerners, stood consistently to the left of their national party. Indeed, the similarities between the Southern "demagogues" and the Western "sons of wild jackasses" make it difficult to avoid the conclusion that they were the products of many similar factors. It is not surprising that Huey Long professed his willingness to support a Western progressive for president.

Attitudes on the race question provided one great difference between the Southern agrarians and those of the West. The last decade of the nineteenth century and the first of the present one saw a general movement throughout the South to disfranchise the Negro by constitutional and legislative enactment.<sup>59</sup> In this movement the earlier of the Tillman-Long group played conspicuous and leading parts.<sup>60</sup> Their attitudes on this subject not only differentiated them from the Western agrarians,

<sup>59</sup> W. Roy Smith, "Negro Suffrage in the South," in *Studies in Southern History and Politics*, 241.

<sup>60</sup> Garrard Harris, "A Defense of Governor Vardaman," in *Harper's Weekly*, XLIX (1905), 236-37; James W. Garner, in a letter to the *Outlook* (New York, 1870-), LXXV (1903), 139-40; editorial, in *Review of Reviews* (New York, 1890-), XXVIII (1903), 403; Brewton, *Life of Watson*, 305; Thomas E. Watson, "Why I am Still a Populist," in *Review of Reviews*, XXXVIII (1908), 306; Wade, "Jefferson, New Style," *loc. cit.*, 137. Ray Stannard Baker discusses the race issue in a series of articles appearing in the *American Magazine*, which includes: "The Riddle of the Negro," LXIII (1907), 518 ff., "The Negro in Politics," "The Black Man's Silent Power," and "The New Southern Statesmanship," LXVI (1908), 169-80, 288-300, 381-91.

but also drew frequent charges of demagoguery from the North and East:<sup>61</sup> charges which many Southerners have accepted on the assumption that the Negro had been removed from the politics of their section with the end of reconstruction. As a matter of fact, those extralegal methods which had driven the black from power had not deprived him of his ballot to the extent that has generally been assumed. Conservative leaders, like Hampton and Lamar, had sought to control rather than disfranchise him.<sup>62</sup> Several facts will indicate the continued political influence of the Negro in post-reconstruction days. The Lower South, during this period, sent seventeen Republicans to Congress, four of whom were colored.<sup>63</sup> In Mississippi a Negro sat in the legislature of 1882,<sup>64</sup> and the blacks constituted more than eleven per cent of the total registration two years after the adoption of the literacy and "understanding" test.<sup>65</sup> South Carolina's constitutional convention of 1895 included six Negro delegates.<sup>66</sup>

Several factors contributed to that movement to deprive the Negro completely of his ballot, which had its beginnings around 1890, and with which the new Southern leadership was so closely identified. It seems that Professor Garner has overemphasized demagoguery as a cause of the "recrudescence" of the race issue.<sup>67</sup> In this connection, Professor Phillips recognized the Force Bill and the activities of Northern extremists as factors. "For every Lodge and Foraker," he declares, "there arose a Tillman and a Vardaman, with a Watson and a Blease

<sup>61</sup> James W. Garner, "Southern Politics Since the Civil War," in *Studies in Southern History and Politics*, 378-85; Charles P. Sweeney, "Bigotry in the South," in *Nation*, CXI (1920), 585-86; Mecklin, "Vardamanism," *loc. cit.*, 461-63; editorial, in *Current Literature*, XXXVI (1904), 288; Warr, "Blease of South Carolina," *loc. cit.*, 25-32; editorial, in *Outlook*, CIX (1915), 156-57.

<sup>62</sup> Walter L. Fleming, *The Sequel of Appomattox* (New Haven, 1919), 50-52; William A. Dunning, *Reconstruction, Political and Economic* (New York, 1907), 267-69; Claude G. Bowers, *The Tragic Era* (Cambridge, 1929), 514-15. Lamar's conservative attitude appears repeatedly in Wirt Armistead Cate, *Lucius Q. C. Lamar* (Chapel Hill, 1935).

<sup>63</sup> *Biographical Directory of the American Congress*, *passim*.

<sup>64</sup> Cate, *Lamar*, 394.

<sup>65</sup> *Annual Cyclopaedia*, N.S., XVII (1892), 472.

<sup>66</sup> Simkins, *Tillman Movement*, 209-12.

<sup>67</sup> Garner, "Southern Politics Since the Civil War," *loc. cit.*, 367-87.

to spare.”<sup>68</sup> Theodore Roosevelt’s entertainment of Booker T. Washington at the White House did nothing to allay the movement.<sup>69</sup> There had been a decided shift in Negro population from the upland counties to the towns and cities as well as to the delta and coastal plains.<sup>70</sup> The inevitable effect of such a shift, so long as the Negro voted, was to transfer political influence from the white counties to the towns and to the black belt. Tillman voiced the resentment of the upcountry whites at this loss of influence within the party by demanding that apportionment of representation in the Democratic convention be according to white population.<sup>71</sup> Too, the economic competition with the Negro was felt most keenly by the whites of the small-farmer, tenant groups. While this factor is intangible and hard to evaluate, there can be no doubt as to its presence.<sup>72</sup>

The most important factor, no doubt, in this “recrudescence” of the race issue was the part that the Negro had played in Southern politics during the period of the agrarian revolt. In the contests between conservatives and farmers, both sides saw the importance of the colored vote and sought to gain it. The degree to which the conservatives succeeded in these efforts is illustrated by results in Alabama in 1892. The Populists carried all the counties of the state except twelve in the black belt. In these, where the Negro constituted more than two thirds of the population, the Democrats gained sufficient majorities to carry the election. Practically the same thing happened in the election of 1894.<sup>73</sup> Granting this as an extreme case, there can be little doubt as to the telling effect with which the conservatives voted the Negro

<sup>68</sup> Ulrich B. Phillips, “The Central Theme of Southern History,” in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXXIV (1928), 30-43.

<sup>69</sup> Editorial, in *Review of Reviews*, XXVIII (1903), 403; Harris, “A Defense of Vardaman,” *loc. cit.*, 236-37.

<sup>70</sup> This movement is suggested by Brooks, *Agrarian Revolution in Georgia*, 16. Vardaman mentioned the drift to the towns in his message to a special session of the legislature in 1906, *Journal of the Senate* for that session, as does Professor Garner in his letter to the *Outlook*, LXXV (1903), 139-40.

<sup>71</sup> Simkins, *Tillman Movement*, 57 ff.

<sup>72</sup> Mecklin recognizes the influence of economic competition in his discussion of “Vardamanism.”

<sup>73</sup> Smith, “Negro Suffrage in the South,” *loc. cit.*, 243.

against the revolting farmers.<sup>74</sup> Professor Arnett summed up the situation when he declared that the black "was generally granted a free ballot (often several of them) and a fair count (sometimes in excess of the possible voting population)."<sup>75</sup> There is little wonder that Tillman, Watson, Vardaman, and others, as spokesmen of the farmers of the white counties, were determined to eliminate the Negro as a balance of power that was almost certain to be used against them. If their course in this respect be demagoguery, at least it is understandable.

It is not possible to estimate the significance of the Tillman-Long type of leadership in Southern politics by a single generalization. By that token, one must question the old idea of "the bottom rail on top." It is not reasonable to assume that a race, which for a hundred years had produced outstanding men in the field of government and politics, went suddenly "moronic." Of course it cannot be denied that the war had taken its toll of potential leaders. Too, greater recognition must be given the fact that, with the return of peace, more attractive opportunities drew to other sections many who might have contributed much to the leadership of the South. Nor may one overlook the influence of postwar economic and social conditions. The leisured class tended to disappear, while the fight for mere subsistence became more absorbing. The race question, with its social, economic, and political aspects changed, continued to be, in a large measure, "the central theme of Southern history."

With full recognition of the factors just mentioned, the solution to the Tillman-Long phenomena appears to lie in the growing influence of industrialism and the new system of merchandising and financing.

<sup>74</sup> The part played by the Negro vote at this time is recognized by William Garrett Brown, *The Lower South in American History* (New York, 1903), 256-58; Smith, "Negro Suffrage in the South," *loc. cit.*; Hicks, *Populist Revolt*, 253-54; Phillips, "Central Theme of Southern History," *loc. cit.*, 43; Simkins, *Tillman Movement*, 83, 106, 129; Lewinson, "The Negro in the White Class and Party Struggle," *loc. cit.*, 364-65; Melvin J. White, "Populism in Louisiana During the Nineties," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, V (1919), 12-13; Rowland, *History of Mississippi*, II, 302. The result of Negro voting in North Carolina is described by John D. Hicks, "The Farmers' Alliance in North Carolina," in *North Carolina Historical Review*, II (1925), 162 ff.; Garner, "Southern Politics Since the Civil War," *loc. cit.*, 377.

<sup>75</sup> Arnett, *Populist Movement in Georgia*, 42-43, 183-84.

Agriculture had lost its primacy at Washington, and was rapidly losing it in the South. Like the Westerners, Southern farmers were revolting against a changed order that seemed to threaten economic ruin, social inferiority, and political impotence. The Southerners, however, conducted their revolt under conditions peculiar to their section, chief among which was the race question. Again, the South differed from the West in the degree to which industrialism was commanding the support of its natural leadership. Too many of the Confederate brigadiers and their class had subordinated their planting interests to merchandising, moneylending, railroad and industrial promotion, and the development of resources. The divergence between the interests of this class and the "dirt farmers" became more accentuated. The former took for themselves the old tradition. The spokesmen of the latter came to be regarded as "demagogic upstarts" by the self-styled "better elements" of their section. As a matter of fact, a calm view of their accomplishments and of the conditions which produced them must raise a question as to their demagoguery. One reaches the conclusion that perhaps these despised "upstarts," as spokesmen of the agrarian interests, more nearly represented a continuation of the political and economic ideas of the ante-bellum South than did the "developers of resources," who were engaged in forming a New South.



# Survival of the Plantation System in Louisiana

By ROGER WALLACE SHUGG

There has long been a popular belief that after the Civil War plantations all over the South broke up into small farms.<sup>1</sup> Between 1860 and 1880, according to census reports, the number of Southern landholdings was doubled, increasing from 549,109 to 1,252,249, and their average size was cut in half, declining from 365 to 157 acres.<sup>2</sup> Such evidence is still cited in historical textbooks to prove that the old plantation system was destroyed by an agrarian revolution.<sup>3</sup> This exaggerated idea arose from the failure of census marshals to distinguish between tenants and proprietors, lease- and freeholds.<sup>4</sup> Because land rented by share croppers was put in the same category as farms owned outright, and the several tracts held by a planter were not registered as a single unit,<sup>5</sup> it appeared that peasants rather than peons had taken the place of slaves.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Under another title, "Post-bellum Agrarian Tenure and Conflict in Louisiana," and with a few omissions, this paper was read before the Southern Historical Association at its second annual meeting in Nashville, November 21, 1936.

<sup>2</sup> *Thirteenth Census, 1910*, V, 878.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., Charles A. and Mary R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization* (New York, 1927), II, 269; Harry J. Carman, *Social and Economic History of the United States*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1934), II, 589-90; Samuel E. Morison and Henry S. Commager, *The Growth of the American Republic* (New York, 1930), 627.

<sup>4</sup> United States Commissioner of Agriculture, *Report of 1886*, p. 418.

<sup>5</sup> This deficiency makes it impossible to use the separate classification of land and landholders according to tenure, which was inaugurated by the census in 1880, as an index of the plantation system.

<sup>6</sup> There are several excellent studies of the development of peonage, especially in Georgia. See Enoch M. Banks, *The Economics of Land Tenure in Georgia* (New York, 1905); Robert P. Brooks, *The Agrarian Revolution in Georgia, 1865-1912* (Madison, Wis., 1914); Clara M. Thompson, *Reconstruction in Georgia* (New York, 1915). Only Brooks, however, seems to appreciate the difficulties raised by the old census methods. *Agrarian Revolution in Georgia*, 41-45.

While there was beyond doubt considerable redistribution in the ownership of real estate, to an extent which the historian is unable to measure for want of accurate census records, nevertheless the plantation system was not obliterated. In fertile regions where colored labor was plentiful, the large estate remained the primary basis of agricultural production.<sup>7</sup> Far from there being any agrarian turnover, change was confined to methods of labor and finance. Planters thought it best, like a South Carolinian, "to work *several farms* on the same plantation," allotting parcels of their land to freedmen and controlling them through a form of credit known as the crop lien.<sup>8</sup> Fields once cultivated by gangs of slaves were now worked by families who shared the produce with landlords; but the subdivision of these estates did not change their ownership. There was less discipline of labor and consequently less profit for capital than under the black codes of slavery. But "the planter princes of the old time," as Henry W. Grady observed, did not vanish from the South; they were "still lords of acres, though not of slaves."<sup>9</sup>

When this fact was at last recognized by the census officials in 1910, they made a special survey of black belt counties, and for the first time designated as a plantation any continuous tract of land which was controlled by an individual or corporation but subdivided for cultivation among at least five tenants.<sup>10</sup> According to this criterion, over one third of the landholdings in the black belt were found to be organized in plantations.<sup>11</sup> The average size of these estates was 724 acres, or more than six times the average previously reported for all properties without regard to their consolidated ownership.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Since the plantation system "was less dependent upon slavery than slavery was upon it," as Ulrich B. Phillips observed, it might be expected to survive the abolition of Negro bondage. See Phillips, "The Decadence of the Plantation System," in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (Philadelphia, 1890-), XXXV (1910), 37.

<sup>8</sup> James E. Crosland, Barnwell District, South Carolina, February 20, 1867, to T. C. Peters, in *A Report upon the Condition of the South etc.* (Baltimore, 1867), 20-21.

<sup>9</sup> "Cotton and Its Kingdom," in *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* (New York, 1850-), LXIII (1881), 722.

<sup>10</sup> *Thirteenth Census, 1910*, V, 878.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 889.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 878, 880.

Although this survey disclosed the preservation of plantations, it came too late to correct the contrary reports of earlier decades, or to explain how large estates survived the vicissitudes of reconstruction. For this twofold purpose the unexamined manuscript assessment rolls of Louisiana,<sup>13</sup> the state which contained the greatest plantations in 1910, were canvassed.<sup>14</sup> Unfortunately, these ledgers leave much to be desired: almost all rolls before 1873 have been lost or destroyed; returns during reconstruction were grossly defective; until 1891 no distinction was made between the races to which owners and tenants belonged; and the number of tenants on each plantation was never recorded. Yet these local tax lists are a better index to agrarian tenure than the national census reports because they show the size of properties according to their actual ownership.

A typical cross section of the distribution of real estate in the planting regions of Louisiana after the Civil War is to be found in the records of five parishes. Two, Concordia in cotton and Iberville in cane sugar, represent the great plantations and staple crops of the Mississippi River bottoms. Two more, Catahoula and Lafourche, illustrate conditions in the adjoining regions of mixed soil and varied topography, where small properties were interspersed among the large, again in each staple. The last parish, Natchitoches, is divided between the cotton-growing alluvium of the Red River and the farming uplands of the north, where agrarian discontent broke forth in Populism during the nineties.<sup>15</sup> Two of these five parishes, Lafourche and Catahoula, contained a majority of white people; the others belonged to the black belt.<sup>16</sup>

The following table presents a statistical description of landholdings in these representative parishes. Because the number of tenants on each estate was never reported, even by local assessors, the size of a property is the only available criterion for distinguishing farms from plantations.

<sup>13</sup> Stored in the basement of the new Capitol, Baton Rouge.

<sup>14</sup> Although Mississippi had the largest proportion of land organized in plantations, these estates did not equal in size those of Louisiana, which embraced an average of 904 acres. *Thirteenth Census, 1910*, V, 886, 889.

<sup>15</sup> For topography, soil, and staples, see E. W. Hilgard, "Report on the Cotton Production of the State of Louisiana," *Tenth Census, 1880*, V, 47-48, 51, 55, 66.

<sup>16</sup> *Eleventh Census, 1890*, I, 489-90.

I have followed local usage in classifying as plantations all properties of more than 100 acres;<sup>17</sup> but since larger estates might often be cultivated without tenants, I have segregated those over 500 acres, which were impossible to operate except as tenant plantations, and compared them with those under 51 acres, which could not support more than the family of the owner. Whatever doubt remains as to the validity of these somewhat arbitrary distinctions may be resolved by reference to the proportions of ownership and tenancy. The table is divided into two parts, a static description of the distribution of landholdings in each decade, and a dynamic analysis of the rate of increase or decrease by twenty and forty year periods.

AGRARIAN PATTERN OF LOUISIANA, 1860-1900<sup>18</sup>  
(ACCORDING TO SELECTED PARISHES)

STATIC					
<i>Per centum</i>	1860	1873	1880	1891	1900
All landholdings.....	100	100	100	100	100
Farms.....	66	26	30	35	42
under 51 acres.....	51 +	12 +	16	18	20
51-100 acres.....	14 +	13 +	14	17	22
Plantations.....	34	74	70	65	58
101-500 acres.....	23	47	48 +	49	47
over 500 acres.....	11	27	21 +	16	11
All landholders.....	..	100	100	100	100
Proprietors.....	..	57	53	48	48
Tenants.....	..	43	47	52	52

  

DYNAMIC			
<i>Per centum Increase or (—) Decrease</i>	1860-1880	1880-1900	1860-1900
All landholdings.....	89	53	189
Farms.....	—14	117	86
Plantations.....	287	29	401

It is apparent from this table that the plantation system in Louisiana not only survived but also expanded after the Civil War. Between 1860

<sup>17</sup> It was said in 1890 that a farm in the hills of northern Louisiana did not exceed 15 acres per hand. *Proceedings of the Louisiana State Agricultural Society, 1890*, pp. 30-31. A family of 7 able-bodied men and women, boys and girls, could cultivate 105 acres; additional tillage would require tenants.

<sup>18</sup> All figures are computed from the MS. Assessment Rolls except those for 1860, which are derived from the *Eighth Census, 1860, Agriculture*, 202.

and 1900 there was a fourfold increase in the number of plantations, while the number of farms was not even doubled. This tendency of the larger properties to outstrip the smaller is further illustrated by the fact that the number of holdings over 500 acres was augmented 203 per cent, and those under 51 acres only 10 per cent. The multiplication of these domains was accompanied from 1873 to 1891 by a steady growth of tenancy, colored and white; and by the end of the century over half the landholders no longer claimed possession of the soil they tilled.

An important difference appears, however, between the periods before and after 1880. In the later years the increase of farms was four times that of plantations, and the number of estates over 500 acres declined nearly one fifth. In the earlier years from 1860 to 1880, with which we are concerned in this study, the opposite occurred. The number of landholdings multiplied 89 per cent, and of plantations, 287 per cent, while the number of farms actually decreased 14 per cent. Until 1880, in short, the larger properties encroached upon the smaller, but after that date farming developed faster than planting. Yet the increase of great estates throughout the century had such cumulative effect that although Louisiana had contained more farms than plantations in 1860,<sup>19</sup> it was dominated by agrarian monopoly in 1900, when its proportion of absentee ownership and overseer management was the largest in the South, and the highest, except for Wyoming, in the entire United States.<sup>20</sup> The evolution of the agrarian pattern in Louisiana was obviously away from the Jeffersonian (and Nashville) ideal of freehold farming and toward the tenancy and insecurity which burden agriculture today.

But the plantation system did not survive in Louisiana without a struggle, bitter and prolonged. Planters were threatened first with confiscation during reconstruction, then with bankruptcy and foreclosure because of adverse economic conditions, and finally with subdivision of

<sup>19</sup> *Eighth Census, 1860, Agriculture*, 202. Cf. Lewis C. Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860*, 2 vols. (Washington, 1933), I, 530; II, 903.

<sup>20</sup> J. M. Blodgett, "Wages of Farm Labor in the United States," United States Department of Agriculture, *Miscellaneous Series Bulletin No. 26* (Washington, 1903), 54-55.

their domains at the behest of agrarian philosophers, whose program seemed to be the only solution for grave difficulties of labor and finance.

First to endanger landed property were the freedmen and their radical sympathizers at Washington, Republicans like Carl Schurz and Thaddeus Stevens.<sup>21</sup> Rumor ran wild through the South that the Negro might obtain "forty acres and a mule" from the expropriation of his old master,<sup>22</sup> and there was apprehension of a colored uprising at Christmas in 1865.<sup>23</sup> In response to a petition from frightened Louisiana planters, General Joseph S. Fullerton of the local Freedmen's Bureau warned the Negro that he was free—free to work, but not to seize his employer's land. "The Government will not do more for you," Fullerton informed the colored folk, "than for the white laborers who are your neighbors."<sup>24</sup> So the landless poor, whether black or white, were not to receive title to the fields they worked. Southern planters soon became confident that the agrarian ambitions of Stevens, to distribute Confederate domains among the freedmen,<sup>25</sup> would be repulsed by Northern conservatives lest such a revolutionary example excite their own factory hands to demand a similar division of industrial property.<sup>26</sup>

The specter of agrarianism appeared next in New Orleans, when military reconstruction was inaugurated. At the radical constitutional convention of 1868 there were some colored delegates who desired to break up plantations, especially in the black belt Sugar Bowl, by prohibiting the purchase of tracts larger than 150 acres at distress sales, and by taxing uncultivated land double the rate of land in use.<sup>27</sup> But

<sup>21</sup> "In the independent possession of landed property," observed Schurz, intelligent Negroes saw "the consummation of their deliverance." See his partisan "Report of Carl Schurz on the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana," in *Senate Executive Documents*, 39 Cong., 1 Sess., I, No. 2, pp. 30-31. Otherwise they would "be liberated from domestic slavery, only to be remitted to slavery to skill and capital." *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), After the War Series, III (1867), 353.

<sup>22</sup> Walter L. Fleming, *Documentary History of Reconstruction*, 2 vols. (Cleveland, 1906-1907), I, 350-60.

<sup>23</sup> New Orleans *Crescent*, October 20, 1865.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, October 21, 1865.

<sup>25</sup> *Nation* (New York, 1865-), IV (1867), 345; James A. Woodburn, *Life of Thaddeus Stevens* (Indianapolis, 1913), 521-35.

<sup>26</sup> *De Bow's Review*, A.W.S., IV (1867), 587-88.

<sup>27</sup> *Official Journal of the Proceedings of the Convention for Framing a Constitution for the State of Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1867-1868), 110, 267.

the steering committee, which had a white majority,<sup>28</sup> defeated this threat to the plantation system; only land sold by order of the courts was to be broken up into small tracts.<sup>29</sup> After a brief skirmish the more progressive Negro leaders abandoned all dreams of agrarian reform, and advised their race to work and save money enough to buy parcels of the great estates for homesteads.<sup>30</sup> So ended the freedmen's short-lived and feeble attack on landed property.

Although planters were now secure in legal title to their domains, they sometimes lost them beneath the crushing load of taxes imposed by corrupt and extravagant reconstruction legislatures.<sup>31</sup> From the election of Governor Henry C. Warmoth in 1868 to the downfall of Governor Stephen B. Packard in 1877, the tax rate doubled, and at its peak amounted to 21½ mills.<sup>32</sup> While the value of property had been reduced nearly one half, individual taxes almost doubled.<sup>33</sup> To avoid expropriation by an avaricious government, planters often pledged standing crops for money to meet their public obligations.<sup>34</sup> The property of those who were hopelessly in arrears, when sold at depreciated auction prices, brought the state over a quarter of a million dollars.<sup>35</sup> Fully as oppressive as this confiscatory taxation was the arbitrary and inequitable assessment on which it was based.<sup>36</sup> When such injustice

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Henry C. Warmoth, *War, Politics and Reconstruction* (New York, 1930), 54-55; W. E. B. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction* (New York, 1935), 468.

<sup>29</sup> *Proceedings of the Convention for Framing a Constitution for . . . Louisiana*, 1867-1868, pp. 266, 306; Constitution of 1868, Art. 132.

<sup>30</sup> *St. Landry Progress*, April 11, 1868. This intelligent organ of the progressive colored minority deserves more attention: it shows the different course reconstruction might have taken if not corrupted by Scalawags, Carpetbaggers, and ignorant Negroes.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Ella Lonn, *Reconstruction in Louisiana after 1868* (New York, 1918), 344-45.

<sup>32</sup> Auditor of Public Accounts, *Report of 1879*, p. 291.

<sup>33</sup> *Eleventh Census, 1890, Report on Wealth, Debt, and Taxation*, 14, 61.

<sup>34</sup> Auditor of Public Accounts, *Report of 1871*, p. 181.

<sup>35</sup> *Id.*, *Report of 1879*, p. 290. Lonn, *Reconstruction in Louisiana*, 345 n., cites the *New Orleans Times*, February 16, 1875, which advertised sheriff's sales that would "deprive one hundred and two families of homes." This situation was equally serious in the country. See *Opelousas Courier*, October 30, 1869; *Shreveport Times*, May 30, 1873.

<sup>36</sup> Radicals complained that river bottom plantations were never taxed enough. See Auditor of Public Accounts, *Report of 1871*, p. 158; Governor William P. Kellogg, *Special Message to Extra Session of the General Assembly, 1875*, p. 5. Conservatives objected that taxation was unequal and confiscatory, a weapon of official reprisals. See Attorney General, *Report of 1878*, pp. 9-10.

could no longer be borne, a Tax Resisting Association was organized in 1873,<sup>37</sup> and its stubborn fight against the exploitation of private property by corrupt public officials contributed to the eventual collapse of reconstruction. In this revolt the Shreveport *Times* took a conspicuous part; its editorial propaganda demonstrated that the power of taxation was becoming an instrument of destruction to the capital of both planters and merchants.<sup>38</sup> Their desperate situation was revealed by the constitutional convention of 1879, whose delegates complained that the landed interests had been nearly taxed out of existence, and cited in proof such parishes as Union, where 1400 people were in arrears; Lafayette, where a considerable proportion of land had been forfeited to the state; and Caddo, where it was claimed that taxes left the planter no margin of profit.<sup>39</sup> The temper of outraged landlords found vent in many economic safeguards of the new constitution. Delinquent taxpayers were granted relief, the legislature was forbidden to contract future debts except to suppress insurrection, and the ordinary tax rate was reduced to six mills.<sup>40</sup> Planters who weathered the storms of reconstruction made the new constitution a bulwark of their agricultural system.

Their ability to survive had been tested by the poverty resulting from a war which was lost and the economic misfortunes which followed in its train. Four years of fighting prostrated the planting aristocracy, upon whom fell the larger share of Louisiana's tremendous loss of wealth, estimated at half of all the assessed property.<sup>41</sup> The countryside, observed a rural correspondent, was "ground to powder between contending armies," and the ruin of war was not salvaged by its aftermath, "overflows and cotton worms, rains and politicians."<sup>42</sup> It was difficult

<sup>37</sup> New Orleans *Picayune*, April 25, 1873.

<sup>38</sup> Shreveport *Times*, April 29, 1873, *et passim*, 1870-1877; incomplete files, partially burned, at the *Times* office, Shreveport.

<sup>39</sup> "Report of the Committee on Public Debt," in *Official Journal of the Proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of 1879* (New Orleans, 1879), Append., pp. 89, 60, 65, 80.

<sup>40</sup> *Constitution of 1879*, reprinted by the Secretary of State, *Report of 1902*, pp. 220, 217, 174-75, 205.

<sup>41</sup> Auditor of Public Accounts, *Report of 1866*, p. 199; *De Bow's Review*, A.W.S., III (1867), 474-75.

<sup>42</sup> *St. Mary's Planters' Banner*, quoted in the New Orleans *Picayune*, August 7, 1867.



to profit by the high postwar prices of cotton and sugar,<sup>43</sup> because the levees needed expensive repairs and the sugarhouses required costly new machinery.<sup>44</sup> Land which lay in waste, with fewer hands and less capital to restore it, depreciated so much—Louisiana and South Carolina suffering most in this respect<sup>45</sup>—that mortgages on many plantations were foreclosed at a third of their prewar value.<sup>46</sup>

How many estates changed hands, or how often, it is at present impossible to judge. The contemporary press made no mention of any drastic overturn in the proprietorship of cotton plantations.<sup>47</sup> After the local crop failures of 1866-1867,<sup>48</sup> it was estimated that not one cotton planter in five could start the next year without giving a lien on his crop for seed and supplies.<sup>49</sup> With money easy to borrow after the war,<sup>50</sup> however, cotton planters who owned their land were able to keep it by going into debt.<sup>51</sup> But the expensive and speculative nature of sugar cultivation, which combined a highly capitalized manufacture with a none too reliable agriculture,<sup>52</sup> led to a revolution in ownership. Almost half the sugar planters in 1869 bore names that slaveholding families would not have recognized.<sup>53</sup> More and more estates were bought by partnerships and corporations, often with the help of Northern capital, which equipped them financially to improve the machinery and endure

<sup>43</sup> See the New Orleans *Picayune*, September 1, 1874; *Price Current Yearly Report*, 1875-1876, p. xvi.

<sup>44</sup> New Orleans *Picayune*, September 1, 1866; Governor Madison Wells, *Message to the General Assembly*, 1867, p. 3; United States Commissioner of Agriculture, *Report of 1871*, p. 49.

<sup>45</sup> United States Commissioner of Agriculture, *Report of 1867*, pp. 105-106.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*; Henry Latham, *Black and White* (London, 1867), 166.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. New Orleans *Picayune* and *Commercial Bulletin*, 1866-1876. Cotton plantations were never reported in a commercial census like those of P. A. Champomier and L. Bouchereau for sugar.

<sup>48</sup> New Orleans *Picayune*, September 19, 1867.

<sup>49</sup> T. C. Dunn, *Morehouse Parish* (New Orleans, 1885), 28-29.

<sup>50</sup> New Orleans *Commercial Bulletin*, December 22, 1866.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, September 1, 1870; New Orleans *Picayune*, August 6, 1875.

<sup>52</sup> L. Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana, 1870-71*, pp. viii-xiv. The larger sugar plantations were valued at over \$50,000 before the war. New Orleans *Picayune*, January 10, 1860.

<sup>53</sup> Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops . . . 1868-69*, pp. 1-47.

the vicissitudes of sugar culture.<sup>54</sup> The processes of credit and alienation operated to preserve the plantation, if not the planters.

Labor was perhaps the gravest problem to confront proprietors, for the extent of their domains depended on the hands available to cultivate them, and "land without labor [was] worthless."<sup>55</sup> Many planters, reared in the tradition of slavery, could not bring themselves to believe that the Negro would till the fields voluntarily.<sup>56</sup> Their skepticism was expressed by the *Picayune*, which advised "the white man [to] go to work as if he were Robinson Crusoe, without a man Friday."<sup>57</sup> Looking forward to white immigration to replace the inefficient freedmen, this newspaper predicted that "farms will multiply and plantations will diminish."<sup>58</sup>

From the difficulties of adapting ex-slaves to plantation tenantry sprang an agrarian philosophy which championed the subdivision of estates. Its most articulate and untiring advocate was Daniel Dennett, editor of the *St. Mary's Planters' Banner* in the Sugar Bowl, who later preached his gospel from the agricultural columns of the *Picayune*.<sup>59</sup> He was at first supported by James D. B. De Bow, famous political economist of slavery, who declared that "the South must throw her immense uncultivated domain into the market at a low price; reduce the quantity of land held by individual proprietors, and . . . induce an influx of population and capital from abroad."<sup>60</sup> "Small farms and white labor," as Dennett said, "or large farms and coolie labor may save the land."<sup>61</sup>

First to be tried was the latter alternative. Strenuous efforts were made to preserve the plantation system and to discipline the Negro by

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 1870-71, pp. 11-15, 40-44; C. Nordhoff, *The Cotton States* (New York, 1876), 69. In Iberville and Lafourche, for example, over half the sugarhouses were owned by partners or corporations.

<sup>55</sup> United States Commissioner of Agriculture, *Report of 1867*, p. 426.

<sup>56</sup> *St. Mary's Planters' Banner*, quoted in the New Orleans *Commercial Bulletin*, January 16, 1867; Opelousas *Southern Sentinel*, December 21, 1867.

<sup>57</sup> December 1, 1867.

<sup>58</sup> July 2, 1865.

<sup>59</sup> January 24, 1873, *et passim*.

<sup>60</sup> *De Bow's Review*, A.W.S., I (1866), 8.

<sup>61</sup> *St. Mary's Planters' Banner*, quoted in the New Orleans *Commercial Bulletin*, January 16, 1867.

importing enough Chinese to force the freedmen to choose between competition and starvation.<sup>62</sup> Some Orientals were brought from Cuba in 1866,<sup>63</sup> and in the following years, colonies of Catholic Chinese from the Philippines.<sup>64</sup> But they soon deserted the plantations to become independent fishermen and truck farmers for the New Orleans market.<sup>65</sup> The idea of keeping large estates intact by replacing Negroes with coolies proved to be a fantasy, if only because Louisiana planters could not compete with the wages offered Oriental labor in California and on the Pacific railroads.<sup>66</sup>

Would Dennett's other alternative, "small farms and white labor," succeed? Upon such a policy of agrarian reorganization depended the efficiency and prosperity of agriculture in the South, according to De Bow.<sup>67</sup> He was seconded by L. Bouchereau, compiler of the annual sugar reports, who advised cane growers to attract industrious Germans from the Middle West by giving them patches of land.<sup>68</sup> Immigration was indeed the only prospective source of white labor, because native "poor whites" would not leave their hill farms for the plantation lowlands, which were thought to be sickly with yellow fever, hard to cultivate, and overrun by Negroes, with whom white farmers had little sympathy and even less desire to compete either as share croppers or wage earners.<sup>69</sup>

To encourage foreign immigration, an official bureau was established by conservative Democrats and maintained by radical Republicans.<sup>70</sup> Thousands of pamphlets, describing Louisiana as a Garden of Eden,

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, September 1, 1870; *Opelousas Courier*, August 21, 1869.

<sup>63</sup> *Opelousas Courier*, October 23, 1869.

<sup>64</sup> Commissioners of Emigration, *Report of 1870*, p. 9; *New Orleans Commercial Bulletin*, November 9, 1870.

<sup>65</sup> Commissioners of Emigration, *Report of 1870*, p. 10.

<sup>66</sup> *New Orleans Picayune*, January 9, 30, 1870.

<sup>67</sup> *De Bow's Review*, A.W.S., I (1866), 8.

<sup>68</sup> Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops . . . 1868-69*, p. viii; 1870-71, pp. xviii-xx.

<sup>69</sup> Interview with H. L. Brian, Shreveport, May 1, 1933. Cf. S. H. Lockett, "Louisiana As It Is" (MS. in Howard Memorial Library, New Orleans), 129-30, 215-17, 223.

<sup>70</sup> *Louisiana Session Laws*, 1866, No. 105, pp. 198-202.

were scattered abroad.<sup>71</sup> Yet few foreigners rose to the bait.<sup>72</sup> Immigrants continued to seek lands in the West and could not be diverted to the unfamiliar latitudes of the South, then an unhappy section devastated by war, afflicted with social and political disorder, suffering economic depression, and already pre-empted by Negro labor.<sup>73</sup> But the fundamental reason why immigrants did not come pouring into Louisiana was the relative lack of economic opportunity for the common man. Plantations dominated the fertile lowlands, which their proprietors would not subdivide, even to obtain labor superior to the Negro, or to enhance the general value of real estate by increased settlement.<sup>74</sup> "You want our Germans to take the place of your former slaves," observed the shrewd president of the German Lloyd Steamship Company.<sup>75</sup> So the foreigner avoided Louisiana because it seemed to offer him nothing better than a chance to displace the Negro by working and forever living "like a nigger."

But from the South Atlantic states, the Middle West, and the North came several thousand "poor white" families to farm the piney woods.<sup>76</sup> The national free land in this section of Louisiana was not available under the Homestead Act until 1869. During the next decade it was entered to the extent of half a million acres, not as actual homesteads but chiefly in fraudulent or dummy claims for the purpose of stripping the land of timber.<sup>77</sup> Poor settlers continued as before the war to stake out their farms without going through the formality of law. In any case, neither homesteaders nor squatters disturbed the plantation system.

<sup>71</sup> Commissioners of Emigration, *Report of 1870*, p. 24.

<sup>72</sup> The foreign-born proportion of the state's population, which had reached 13 per cent in 1850, dwindled to 9 per cent in 1870, and to 6 per cent in 1880. *Eleventh Census, 1890*, I, 260-61.

<sup>73</sup> Commissioners of Emigration, *Report of 1870*, pp. 5-6, 9, 21-23.

<sup>74</sup> Bureau of Immigration, *Report of 1868*, p. 16; cf. *Baton Rouge Advocate*, July 25, 1874.

<sup>75</sup> Commissioners of Emigration, *Report of 1870*, p. 22.

<sup>76</sup> *De Bow's Review*, A.W.S., I (1866), 213; *Opelousas Courier*, quoted in the *New Orleans Commercial Bulletin*, December 25, 1866; *New Orleans Picayune*, January 14, 1870; August 2, 1873; *Shreveport Times*, December 21, 1872; Lockett, "Louisiana As It Is," 218, 222.

<sup>77</sup> United States Commissioner, General Land Office, *Report of 1874*, pp. 74-75; *Report of 1877*, pp. 220-21.

The Jeffersonian ideal of freehold farming remained a mirage to trouble the future. It was scorned by planters after the war. Their attitude was expressed by a sugar grower who complained that the advocates of subdivision "ought not to be so liberal with other people's property."<sup>78</sup> Proprietors everywhere were loathe to part with the acres that had once yielded them luxury: to own a large estate was still to enjoy social esteem.<sup>79</sup> Ex-slaveholders were sincerely persuaded that the plantation was the salvation of the colored people, and that without it the land could not support the Negro.<sup>80</sup> To subdivide plantations would have required more credit than the proprietors possessed, because there was "no sale for large tracts of land, and the multitude who want[ed] small tracts . . . [had] no money to pay for them."<sup>81</sup>

The social and economic folly of not having broken up these estates was never forgotten in New Orleans. "So long as there are wastes of idle and unproductive lands blotting the fair face of Louisiana, and starving workmen thronging the streets of New Orleans," it was said, "there can be no such thing as prosperity for the State."<sup>82</sup> When the panic of 1873 threw thousands of laborers out of work, it was brought home to all men that in the city there was "an immense amount of idle muscle," and in the country a vast domain of idle or monopolized land.<sup>83</sup>

What prevented their profitable union and consequently saved the plantation system? The answer is threefold in nature, political, economic, and social. Among the political factors were the collapse of reconstruction, the failure to carry the revolutionary changes of the war beyond the abolition of slavery, and the frustration of all plans to subvert the laws of property, whether undertaken by Republicans or Populists. Bourbon Democracy, composed of an alliance of planters and merchants, stood guard over its property and controlled the govern-

<sup>78</sup> New Orleans *Picayune*, August 13, 1873.

<sup>79</sup> Commissioners of Emigration, *Report of 1870*, p. 15.

<sup>80</sup> New Orleans *Picayune*, August 13, 1873.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, July 24, 1873. Many "desire land, but . . . they cannot get it on credit, nor can they purchase it in fifty-acre lots." *Ibid.*, August 10, 1873.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, April 1, 1875.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, July 25, 1873. Large tracts lay fallow on many plantations for want of labor.

ment in its own interest throughout the nineteenth century except for the interlude of reconstruction.<sup>84</sup>

Among the economic factors which operated to preserve the plantation system, the most important were the large scale necessities of staple agriculture, the subordination of freedmen to peonage, the credit afforded by crop liens, and finally the free play of economic forces which allowed estates to change hands by bankruptcy or alienation. Cotton and especially sugar have always been crops well adapted to cultivation on a large scale, and the stimulus of high post-bellum prices in these staples renewed the extensive tillage of slaveholding days. The expense of maintaining levees and drainage canals in the river bottoms, and of improving machinery in the sugarhouses, combined to make the plantation a capitalistic unit which farmers of small means could not easily break up.<sup>85</sup> The labor essential to its operation was provided by the return of landless freedmen to the soil as they realized that they must work or starve. The ex-slaveholder learned to be landlord, merchant, and overseer, furnishing his tenants the food, clothes, tools, and land necessary to grow staples, while the ex-slave went to work, first for cash, then for crop shares, and in the cane fields for a monthly wage.<sup>86</sup> Although the difficulties of colored labor aggravated the process of reconstruction, and strikes were sometimes suppressed as racial insurrections,<sup>87</sup> owners and tenants reached a *modus vivendi* long before the overthrow of Carpetbag government.

As the planters made it possible for Negroes to support themselves, so in turn the cotton and sugar factors, merchants and banks of New Orleans enabled the planters to resume operation of their estates. Without such credit, extended on the basis of crop liens and blanket mortgages, it is extremely doubtful if the plantation system could have sustained the ruin of war, the occasional crop failures and constant

<sup>84</sup> Detailed evidence for these conclusions will be presented in a forthcoming study of the white farmer and laborer in Louisiana.

<sup>85</sup> New Orleans *Picayune*, September 4, 1873.

<sup>86</sup> New Orleans *Commercial Bulletin*, September 11, 1867; New Orleans *Democrat*, September 1, 1880. Cf. Ulrich B. Phillips, "Plantations with Slave Labor and Free," *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXX (1925), 749.

<sup>87</sup> E.g., the Terrebonne Riot, New Orleans *Picayune*, January 10, 14, 16-18, 20, 1874.

political burden of reconstruction, and the price and tariff fluctuations during the remainder of the century. Luckily for the larger landholders, however, sufficient capital was always available in New Orleans, where it accumulated from Northern and foreign investments and from the profits of expanding commerce.<sup>88</sup> It is really extraordinary that after 1865 the local money market suffered no contraction except the periodic stringency which affected the entire nation at times of severe depression.<sup>89</sup> While planters paid interest as high as twenty-five per cent for financial accommodation and soon found themselves bound hand and foot by the crop lien and blanket mortgage, it was this chain of credit which not only revived plantations after the war but also preserved them intact whenever the burden of debt pushed them into bankruptcy.<sup>90</sup> The title to an estate often changed, but seldom its size, for every acre, all its equipment and crops, were collateral for the credit necessary to work it. Planters and merchants were therefore unable to subdivide their landholdings with any profit, and transfers of ownership precluded the disintegration of landed monopoly.

It was, in short, the planters, freedmen, and factors who preserved the plantation system in Louisiana after the Civil War.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, September 1, 1866; September 1, 1871. It was estimated that in 1871 the New Orleans banks and factors advanced \$30,000,000 on the next season's crops.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, August 6, 1875.

<sup>90</sup> New Orleans *Commercial Bulletin*, September 1, 1869; September 1, 1870; New Orleans *Picayune*, August 13, 1873; *Proceedings of the Louisiana State Agricultural Society*, 1890, p. 36; 1891, p. 71.

# Cultural Life in Nashville on the Eve of the Civil War

*By* F. GARVIN DAVENPORT

In the last decade of the ante-bellum period the city of Nashville was favorably known wherever science, music, drama, and literature were cultivated. During this decade the medical school of the University of Nashville was developed, and by 1860 this school was recognized as one of the best of its type in the United States. But interest in medical science was only one manifestation of Nashville's intellectual activity. The literary department of the University was reorganized and a law school was established. The Nashville Female Academy reached the height of its development during this period and commercial and literary colleges were founded to meet the educational needs of the younger generation. Innumerable private grammar schools were well attended, and in 1852 plans for a public school system were approved by the city council.

Another indication of Nashville's cultural development was the interest shown in the theater. During the fifties better support was given to the drama than in any previous period in the city's history. Grand opera was successfully introduced and concert artists were well received throughout the decade. The minstrels enjoyed a lucrative patronage although their popularity began to wane in 1858.

Nashville did not depend entirely on professional artists for its amusements. The city was rich in amateur talent and this was frequently displayed in concerts and tableaux. Then, too, Nashville possessed its own creative writers and was recognized as one of the most



important publishing centers in the South. Newspapers, periodicals, and books from the Nashville presses circulated throughout the country.

The foundation for this intellectual and cultural development in Nashville had been laid in the preceding decades largely through the labor and the ideals of the educator, Philip Lindsley (1786-1855), and the scientist, Gerard Troost (1776-1850). These two men, the former the president of the University of Nashville from 1825 to 1850 and the latter, professor of chemistry and mineralogy at the same institution from 1827 to 1850, and state geologist from 1832 to 1850, drew the attention of the educational and scientific world to Tennessee and to Nashville. A few years after the death of these pioneers, Dr. W. K. Bowling, the editor of the *Nashville Journal of Medicine and Surgery*, asserted that "The great Lindsley and Troost . . . in making this seat of learning immortal, left the impress of their own mighty intellects upon their generation, and coming posterity will feel and respond to its awakening influence."<sup>1</sup>

Philip Lindsley was born near Morristown, New Jersey, on December 21, 1786. He received his higher education at the College of New Jersey (later Princeton) and was granted the A.M. degree by that institution in 1807. In 1824, after he had successfully filled several positions at Princeton, he was offered the presidency of Cumberland College which was soon to become the University of Nashville.<sup>2</sup> It was probably because the educational needs of the Southwest challenged his ambitions and his ingenuity, that Lindsley decided to cast his lot with the struggling institution in Nashville. His education, experience, and ambitions fitted him for the difficult task of building a university in the West. In some respects, however, the task proved to be more difficult than he expected.

When Lindsley moved to Nashville in 1824, the raw frontier had disappeared. But Tennessee was still "the West," its society was fundamentally rural, and certain characteristics of the frontier remained. It is not sufficient to call these characteristics *rural*. They were not that

<sup>1</sup> *Nashville Journal of Medicine and Surgery* (Nashville, 1851-1861), XI (1856), 167.

<sup>2</sup> L. J. Halsey (ed.), *The Works of Philip Lindsley, D.D.*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1866),

simple. They had a definite historical background and were intricately interwoven with the frontier tradition. When analyzed, this tradition presents three features, namely, materialism, individualism, and a general suspicion of all Eastern educators.

It was such a tradition that proved to be an obstacle to Lindsley's ambitions. But in spite of opposition in one form or another, he succeeded in transforming the old Cumberland College into the University of Nashville,<sup>3</sup> and, although the institution fell short of his ambitions, it became the cornerstone of the educational prominence of Nashville.<sup>4</sup>

Lindsley was a missionary of both common school and higher education in Tennessee. The increase in the number of colleges and schools of all types during the period 1825-1850 was due in no small degree to his influence.<sup>5</sup> Lindsley was a pioneer in the sense that he attempted to bring to an undeveloped section of the country the fruits of education and enlightenment. After a quarter of a century of hard and often unappreciated labor, he left behind him in the minds of the people a spirit of education noteworthy for its vitality and endurance.

While President Lindsley was campaigning in the cause of education, his professor of sciences, Dr. Gerard Troost, was attracting the attention of the scientific world by his work in ethnology, geology, paleontology, botany, and mineralogy. Troost was born in Bois-le-Duc, Holland, in 1776. He was educated in the Universities of Leyden and Amsterdam and received special instruction from the French mineralogist, René Just Hany (1743-1822), and the German geologist, Abraham Gottlob Werner (1750-1817). After various experiences in Europe and the United States, he accepted the professorship of geology, mineralogy, and chemistry in the University of Nashville. This was in 1828, and

I, 11-18; III, 10-27; Philip Lindsley to Rev. William B. Sprague, February 2, 1848 (MS. in Peabody College Library).

<sup>3</sup> Tennessee *Acts of a Local or Private Nature*, 1826, pp. 45-46.

<sup>4</sup> Halsey (ed.), *Works of Philip Lindsley*, I, 219-20, 406.

<sup>5</sup> *American Almanac*, 1830, p. 227; 1850, p. 204; *Compendium of the Sixth Census of the United States*, 1840, p. 71; *Seventh Census of the United States*, 1850, pp. 578, 580, 581.

for the remainder of his life he was associated with Nashville and Tennessee.<sup>6</sup>

On December 21, 1831, the Tennessee legislature authorized a geological survey and Troost was appointed state geologist.<sup>7</sup> He held this position, although at times precariously, until the office was temporarily abolished in 1850, a few months before his death. At a time when very little scientific work was being done west of the Appalachians, Troost made interesting and valuable contributions to mineralogy, paleontology, and geology. He made a careful examination of the coal beds of Tennessee in 1835, and by analysis he came to the conclusion that Tennessee coal was superior in quality to the Kentucky coal then being used in Nashville.<sup>8</sup> He was the first to call attention to the excellent quality of Hawkins County marble, to the high quality of the slate in southeastern Sevier County and to the zinc deposits in the eastern section of the state.<sup>9</sup> As a paleontologist, Troost became interested in the fossils to be found in the Tennessee formations. The work of the archeologist also had its fascination for him.

Troost, the scientist, was as much a pioneer in Tennessee as was Lindsley, the champion of education. He made Tennessee geology-conscious. Although some of his general deductions had to be revised in the light of subsequent and more minute investigations, it was Troost who laid the foundations for a geological study of Tennessee.

Both Troost and Lindsley were indefatigable representatives of culture, and with the aid of a few conscientious Nashville educators, they pointed the way to a more refined and more intelligent civilization. Although some of the seeds of culture which they planted in Nashville's soil were smothered by rank growths of prejudice and indifference,

<sup>6</sup> Halsey (ed.), *Works of Philip Lindsley*, I, 593-633; Henry G. Rooker, "A Sketch of the Life and Work of Dr. Gerard Troost," in *Tennessee Historical Magazine* (Nashville, 1915-), Ser. II, Vol. III (1932), 3-19.

<sup>7</sup> *Tennessee Public Acts*, 1831, pp. 43-44.

<sup>8</sup> Gerard Troost, *Third Geological Report* (Nashville, 1835), 4-6; Silliman's *American Journal of Science and Arts* (New Haven, 1818-), XXX (1836), 391-92.

<sup>9</sup> Troost, *Sixth Geological Report* (Nashville, 1840), 30-32; *id.*, *Ninth Geological Report* (Nashville, 1848), 7-29; James M. Safford, *Geology of Tennessee* (Nashville, 1869), 487 n., 512; *id.*, *A Geological Reconnaissance of the State of Tennessee* (Nashville, 1856), 74.

many took root and bore fruit of lasting importance during the decade immediately preceding the Civil War.

As early as 1829 Lindsley thought that Nashville was ideally situated to become the seat of a medical college.<sup>10</sup> He lamented the fact that such an institution did not exist in the city of his adoption, nor, for that matter, in the entire state. He wondered how long Tennessee would continue to send her youth to Northern cities to learn the healing art.<sup>11</sup> A decade later (1841) the desired medical school was still but a dream and the *Guardian* wondered "why this state of things should be tolerated."<sup>12</sup>

But the situation was tolerated for yet another decade and it was not until November 1, 1851, that the medical school of the University of Nashville opened its doors to the public.<sup>13</sup> The inaugural exercises were quite elaborate and were witnessed by the members of the legislature, who were received by the trustees of the University, the medical faculty, and the first class of medical students.<sup>14</sup>

Shortly after the new medical school opened, the *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* announced that "it would not be surprising were Nashville to become a great medical center."<sup>15</sup> With respect to the faculty, the Boston journal asserted that "There are eight professors of acknowledged worth and enterprise, who are giving character and strength to the Nashville college, which will record its name on the pages of medical history in a manner honorable to their memories in after times."<sup>16</sup>

The eight professors of "acknowledged worth" were: W. T. Briggs, J. M. Watson, A. H. Buchanan, C. K. Winston, Robert M. Porter, W. K. Bowling, Paul F. Eve, and John B. Lindsley.<sup>17</sup> Porter died in 1856 after contracting blood poisoning while at work in the dissecting

<sup>10</sup> Halsey (ed.), *Works of Philip Lindsley*, I, 167-68.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> *Guardian* (Columbia, 1841-1849?), I (1841), 121.

<sup>13</sup> *Nashville Journal of Medicine and Surgery*, I, (1851), 382.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* (Boston, 1828-), XLVI (1852), 485.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 365; also misquoted in *Nashville Journal of Medicine and Surgery*, III (1852), 261.

<sup>17</sup> *Nashville Directory*, I (1853), 71.

room. He was succeeded by T. R. Jennings, who was well-known as a teacher of anatomy in Tennessee, having opened dissecting rooms in Nashville in 1838.<sup>18</sup>

While all these men were capable, two in particular—John Berrien Lindsley and Paul Fitzsimons Eve—deserve special notice. Lindsley (1822-1897) was professor of chemistry and pharmacy and dean of the new medical school. The medical school project as finally formulated had been conceived in his mind and it was due in large part to his ability and determination that dreams and paper plans were finally converted into something more tangible. The ambitions of Philip Lindsley were brought closer to realization in the accomplishments of his son.

John B. Lindsley and the men who co-operated with him were determined from the beginning to create an institution that would rank professionally not third or fourth, but at the very top. The great obstacles in their path did not daunt them, but on the contrary seemed to inspire them to greater efforts. Nothing seemed impossible to these ambitious doctors of Nashville and not only were they able to create a medical college in a surprisingly short time, but they were also able to build one capable of holding its own with the best of the day.<sup>19</sup>

Paul F. Eve (1806-1877) became one of the leading surgeons of the South in the period from 1850 to 1877. He received his education at Franklin College (later the University of Georgia), at the medical school of the University of Pennsylvania, and in the clinics of the most famous surgeons of London and Paris.<sup>20</sup> Already in 1850, Eve had attracted attention by the skillful operations he had performed while connected with the medical school in Atlanta. Among these was the removal of the entire uterus from a Negress. In all probability Eve was

<sup>18</sup> John B. Lindsley, "An Address on the Life and Character of Robert M. Porter, M. D.," quoted in the *Nashville Journal of Medicine and Surgery*, XII (1857), 335 ff.

<sup>19</sup> Philip M. Hamer (ed.), *The Centennial History of the Tennessee State Medical Association, 1830-1930* (Nashville, 1930), 51; *Nashville Journal of Medicine and Surgery*, III (1852), 258.

<sup>20</sup> Paul F. Eve, "Address, November 3, 1851," in *Addresses of the Medical Department of the University of Nashville* (Nashville, 1851-1872), 32; T. Chalmers Dow, "Paul Fitzsimmons Eve, M. D.," in *Transactions of the American Medical Association* (Philadelphia, 1848-1882), XXIX (1878), 641-46.

the first surgeon in America to accomplish this feat.<sup>21</sup> He was particularly successful in removing stones from the bladder. Out of twenty-five operations of this nature, only four resulted in fatalities, and only one of these was due directly to the operation.<sup>22</sup> And so in Eve, the students at Nashville found a skillful, brave, and experienced surgeon.

Judged by the standards of the day, the course in medical science and surgery offered by the medical school of the University of Nashville was thorough and complete. In order to graduate with the degree of M.D., the student was required to spend three years in the office of a regular physician, attend two full courses of lectures at the medical school, write an acceptable thesis on some medical topic, and pass a satisfactory examination.<sup>23</sup>

With Eve in mind it would seem that the faculty of the medical school of the University of Nashville was farther advanced scientifically speaking in the field of anatomy and surgery than it was in therapeutics. The remedies employed in the treatment of disease seem strongly akin to quackery when considered in the light of twentieth-century science. In 1850 very little was actually known about either the cause or the cure of disease and the Nashville physicians were quite frank in admitting their ignorance.<sup>24</sup>

An illustration can be given by singling out a common disease, such as pneumonia, and showing what the students of medicine in the University of Nashville were taught concerning its causes and methods of treatment. It was generally believed that the most frequent causes of pneumonia could be traced to changeable weather conditions. Sudden exposure to cold, wearing damp clothes, sleeping in damp beds, wearing

<sup>21</sup> Nineteen similar operations had been performed in Europe prior to Eve's achievement. Paul F. Eve, *A Collection of Remarkable Cases in Surgery* (Philadelphia, 1857), 481-83; *Western Journal of Medicine and Surgery* (Louisville, 1840-1855), VI (1846), 401-407.

<sup>22</sup> Paul F. Eve, "Report of Twenty-five Cases of Urinary Calculus," in *American Journal of Medical Sciences*, N. S., XXIV (1852), 41-53.

<sup>23</sup> *Nashville Journal of Medicine and Surgery*, II (1851), 186; *Annual Annoucement of the Medical Department, University of Nashville* (Nashville, 1851-1910), 1851, p. 6.

<sup>24</sup> John W. Richardson, "The Difficulties and Responsibilities of the Profession" (1853), in *Addresses of the Medical Department*, 4; W. K. Bowling, "Character and Writings of Sydenham" (1854), in *ibid.*, 12.

clothes too thin for the season, running in a sharp, cold atmosphere, heavy blows on the chest, poisonous inhalations, sudden constipation, overindulgence in liquor, and major surgical operations were listed among the causes of this disease.<sup>25</sup> The excessive use of the voice was considered by some to be a contributing cause.<sup>26</sup> Others were of the opinion that malaria was the most prominent cause of pneumonia in the South.<sup>27</sup>

In the treatment of pneumonia there were three remedies, bloodletting, a good cathartic, and the use of mercury. Bloodletting was considered the most important treatment. As all the blood in the system was necessarily forced through the congested lungs which were incapable of functioning properly and hence caused the patient much distress, it was believed that by reducing the amount of blood in the body the pressure and labor of the lungs would be lessened.<sup>28</sup> The amount of blood drawn depended on the stage of the disease, the condition of the pulse, and the constitution of the patient. In general, blood was allowed to flow from "a large orifice" until the pulse improved, the pressure about the chest was relieved, or the patient showed signs of fainting. This process was repeated in twelve or twenty-four hours, provided there was no improvement and provided the patient's pulse and general condition indicated that he could stand it.<sup>29</sup> Some physicians and medical students favored one good bleeding in preference to repeated small ones. For example, in his dissertation on pneumonia, William A. Mulkey declared, "One copious bleeding on the outset will accomplish more than many smaller ones repeated."<sup>30</sup>

It was considered good practice to give the patient a dose of castor oil after the first bleeding. After the cathartic had taken effect, small doses of tartar emetic were administered every hour or two during the day. Several days later, a pill consisting of ipecac (one grain), opium

<sup>25</sup> Samuel B. Brown, "Acute Pneumonia," in *Inaugural Dissertations*, University of Nashville Medical Department (MSS. in Peabody College Library), No. 8 (1851), 29.

<sup>26</sup> Harris Diggs, "Pneumonia," in *ibid.*, No. 413 (1859), 8.

<sup>27</sup> James L. Griffin, "Pneumonia," in *ibid.*, No. 45 (1853), 15.

<sup>28</sup> Brown, "Acute Pneumonia," in *ibid.*, No. 8 (1851), 32 ff.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>30</sup> William A. Mulkey, "Pneumonitis," in *ibid.*, No. 3 (1851), 13.

(one grain), and calomel (two or three grains) was prescribed for the patient. This pill was taken at night and in combination with the doses of tartar emetic which were continued during the day was supposed to produce relaxation and sleep, to lessen the cough, and to prepare the patient for a possible subsequent mercurial treatment.<sup>31</sup>

Mustard plasters, called "blisters," were used by some physicians at any stage of the disease.<sup>32</sup> After the crisis was passed the patient was given an expectorant. Diggs recommended "Syrup of squills and seneca in combination with wine of epicac [*sic*]."<sup>33</sup>

It would be unjust to be too critical of the medical men of the fifties. They must be judged on the basis of the contemporary knowledge of medicine in the leading institutions. They were pioneering and although some were still in the deep woods, others were approaching the clearings where the light was brighter and the path of progress less encumbered with ancient and unscientific doctrines.

Certainly Paul Eve made valuable contributions, especially in the field of surgery. His place in the medical history of the nation is assured. John B. Lindsley deserves high praise for the rôle he played in establishing the medical school of the University of Nashville. This school was the foundation for one of the nation's medical centers of the present time.

By 1850, in addition to the University whose most prominent feature was the medical college, Nashville was well-supplied with academies and schools of all types. For sustained success the Nashville Female Academy, which opened in 1817, had an enviable reputation, but its prosperity was greater during the fifties than in any previous period.<sup>34</sup>

The success of the academy was due to its capable presidents, its liberal curriculum, and its well-trained teachers. During C. D. Elliott's administration (1844-1861), the academy reached the peak of its de-

<sup>31</sup> Brown, "Acute Pneumonia," in *ibid.*, No. 8 (1851), 32 ff.; Diggs, "Pneumonia," in *ibid.*, No. 413 (1859), 9 ff.

<sup>32</sup> Griffin, "Pneumonia," in *ibid.*, No. 45 (1853), 15.

<sup>33</sup> Diggs, "Pneumonia," in *ibid.*, No. 413 (1859), 12.

<sup>34</sup> *Nashville Daily Union and American*, April 15, 1857; *Nashville Directory*, V (1860), 31.



velopment. In 1844, when he took over the administrative office of the school, there was an enrollment of 194 students. By 1860, the number had increased to 513. In 1844, Elliott had a staff of only ten teachers, but by 1860 this had been increased to thirty-eight.<sup>35</sup>

It is interesting to notice that the course of study in the collegiate department of the academy did not require foreign languages. The elimination of Greek and Latin was a bold innovation in an age when the classics were still traditionally regarded as the foundation of any collegiate course. Greek and Latin were taught only when they were desired by the students. The same was true with respect to French, Spanish, and German.<sup>36</sup>

Physical training for the girls and young ladies at the academy was another innovation that attracted considerable attention.<sup>37</sup> Elliott considered dancing good exercise and introduced it for the sake of health, cheerfulness, and recreation, but at the same time "in a manner consistent with the spirit of piety and devotion."<sup>38</sup>

Judged by the standards of the day, the teachers at the Nashville Female Academy were above the average. The fine arts department was especially strong. "In painting, drawing and music," declared Elliott, "we have endeavored to secure for our patrons the very best talent in the country." Some of the teachers were imported from abroad. Thus, in 1860, Elliott engaged two piano instructors who had studied at the *Conservatoire Imperial* and under Henri Herz.<sup>39</sup>

Of the many institutions of learning in Nashville in the fifties, some of the more important schools devoted to higher or professional education were the Nashville Ladies College, the Shelby Medical School, the Southern Commercial College, the Nashville Commercial College, and the Nashville Female Institute. There were various small private

<sup>35</sup> John Woolridge, *History of Nashville* (Nashville, 1890), 404.

<sup>36</sup> *Nashville Female Academy*, July, 1852 (pamphlet in Tennessee State Library, Nashville).

<sup>37</sup> Mrs. Bennett D. Bell, "Female Schools in Tennessee Prior to 1861," in *Confederate Veteran* (Nashville, 1893-1932), XXXII (1924), 171.

<sup>38</sup> *Nashville Female Academy*, October 16, 1857 (circular in Tennessee State Library).

<sup>39</sup> *Nashville Patriot*, January 13, 1860. The two teachers were Camille Brunet and Athalie Gasche.

schools in the city and in the suburbs. In 1852, due in large part to the work of Alfred Hume (1808-1853), a public school system was inaugurated.<sup>40</sup> Hume did not live to see his school plans completed but by 1860 a public high school and several grammar schools were in operation.<sup>41</sup>

It is evident that these educational institutions made valuable contributions to the intellectual development of Nashville society and that they tended to enrich the city's cultural life. In general they followed a policy that may be considered liberal and progressive in the light of the times. Some of the private schools, however, especially those that received church support, became involved in controversies respecting dancing and the theater. There was a strong church element that condemned both of these arts on the grounds that they were sinful and detrimental to society.

But the conservative and occasionally bitter attitude of the church element did not prevent the city from supporting several first-rate dancing academies where fashionable youth were taught all the currently popular steps from the waltz to the difficult *Pas de Rancho*.<sup>42</sup> As a matter of fact, dancing was one of the most popular amusements in Nashville during the period now in review and every holiday of importance was celebrated with fancy balls, cotillion parties, and supper dances.<sup>43</sup> It was not unusual for parties of this nature, made spectacular by fantastic costumes and masks, the glitter of silverware and cut glass and the art of the confectioner, to last until crowing roosters announced the approach of a new day.<sup>44</sup>

Pious church members censored all of these social affairs even when they were held with a more ulterior motive than simply affording pleasure or recreation. Although the enemies of the dance could hardly

<sup>40</sup> Alfred Hume, *Report on the Subject of Public Schools* (Nashville, 1852); *General Laws of the City of Nashville, 1806-1860*, 3 vols. (Nashville, 1860), III, 93.

<sup>41</sup> *Nashville Directory*, V (1860), 60.

<sup>42</sup> *Nashville Daily Gazette*, November 6, 1853; August 8, 1854; Jane Thomas, *Old Days in Nashville* (Nashville, 1897), 91.

<sup>43</sup> *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*, February 17, 1858; *Nashville Daily Gazette*, February 11, 1855.

<sup>44</sup> *Nashville Daily Gazette*, February 11, 1855.

attack the humane purpose of a dance benefit or a charity ball, they could and did criticize what they termed the vanity and immodesty of the ballroom belles whose "charms which nature intended as domestic secrets . . . are publicly exhibited in all their naked loveliness."<sup>45</sup> While it is true that the style of the period called for a low neckline and bare shoulders, it was not so extreme as to cause "profane eyes . . . to revel in unmuslined mysteries sacred to poetic reveries and lovers' dreams."<sup>46</sup>

The conservative church group might fuss and fume day in and day out but dancing continued to be regarded as a social grace by Nashville society. Nor could the attitude of the pious element destroy the theater, the opera, or the minstrels, and these three institutions became an intricate part of Nashville's social and cultural life.

Before 1850, the theater in Nashville had a precarious existence, but with the formation of the Adelphi Theater Company in 1849<sup>47</sup> and the subsequent opening of the company's new theater in 1850,<sup>48</sup> there came a promise of better things. The new Adelphi, exclusive of decorations, cost about \$25,000 and it was claimed that it possessed the second largest stage in the United States.<sup>49</sup> The building was remodeled several times during the decade and the name was changed twice. In 1858, under the management of William Crisp, the house, then known as the Gaiety, was completely renovated. The Nashville *Republican Banner* gave a careful description of the redecorated interior.

The decoration of the auditorium is extremely beautiful, the colors being pale blue, violet, pink and stone white, ornamented with gold. The dome of the ceiling, which spreads over the entire parquette is a pure blue sky. A light arcade on the fluted pillars encloses the dress circle, and the front of the first tier is ornamented with twenty eight crystal chandeliers. The stage has twenty eight foot lights which cast a brilliance upon one of the prettiest act drops we

<sup>45</sup> "Ball Room Belles," in *Parlor Visitor* (Nashville, Murfreesboro, 1854-1857), II (1854), 18.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> Tennessee *Acts*, 1849-1850, pp. 447-48.

<sup>48</sup> J. C. Guild, *Old Times in Tennessee, with Historical, Personal, and Political Scraps and Sketches* (Nashville, 1878), 487.

<sup>49</sup> Mrs. O. Z. Bond, "Life of Brigadier General Felix Kirk Zollicoffer, C. S. A." (MS. in Tennessee State Library), 7.

ever saw. The proscenium has also been elegantly adorned and the side mirrors have been removed to give place to a prettily designed open shell, with ornamental tracings extending to the stage boxes, in front of which is suspended on each side a magnificent chandelier.<sup>50</sup>

Perhaps the three outstanding events in the history of the Nashville theater during the decade, were the appearance of Jenny Lind (1820-1887) in 1851, the first operatic production on May 26, 1854, and the appearance of Edwin Booth (1833-1893) in 1859. The arrival of the Swedish Nightingale in Nashville meant also the arrival of her manager, P. T. Barnum (1810-1891), who was already becoming more myth than man. Early on the morning of March 29, 1851, curious children and eager men and women began to line the river docks and to crowd the bridge over the Cumberland because the news had spread that the famous singer would arrive by boat about nine o'clock. The people were not disappointed. The boat did arrive at nine and Jenny Lind, Barnum, and the entire company landed while the crowd cheered.<sup>51</sup>

By the time the auction of tickets began, the excitement was intense.<sup>52</sup> The first ticket was started at \$50 and finally sold for \$200.<sup>53</sup> Others brought from 25 cents to \$10. The sale of tickets at the first auction alone netted \$2380. Tickets at the box office of the *Adelphi*, whose seating capacity had been temporarily increased,<sup>54</sup> sold for \$4.00 and \$5.00. Standing room tickets were considered cheap at \$3.00. The price of admission to the auction room was 10 cents and the money secured in this way was donated to the orphans of Nashville.<sup>55</sup> This was a typical Barnum gesture. The gross receipts of Jenny Lind's first concert in Nashville amounted to \$7786.30.<sup>56</sup> The sale of tickets for her second

<sup>50</sup> *Republican Banner*, September 5, 1859.

<sup>51</sup> *Nashville Daily Gazette*, March 30, 31, 1851.

<sup>52</sup> P. T. Barnum, *Struggles and Triumphs, or Forty Years' Recollections* (Buffalo, 1873), 344.

<sup>53</sup> *Nashville Daily Gazette*, March 30, April 3, 1851; Guild, *Old Times in Tennessee*, 488.

<sup>54</sup> Guild, *Old Times in Tennessee*, 488; C. G. Rosenberg, *Jenny Lind in America* (New York, 1851), 191.

<sup>55</sup> *Nashville Daily Gazette*, March 30, April 3, 1851.

<sup>56</sup> Barnum, *Struggles and Triumphs*, 353.

concert brought \$4248.<sup>57</sup> This is indicative, not of a smaller audience, but of more sensible bidding in the auction room.

It was a dramatic moment when Jenny Lind made her entrance on the stage of the *Adelphi* and "brought down the house in immense applause." Personally she presented the appearance of "a simple, chaste, and unaffected lady, with a face not handsome, nor to a stranger prepossessing, yet withal, not without a certain degree of attraction."<sup>58</sup> She was dressed in a very simple pink silk gown which emphasized her slenderness.<sup>59</sup>

Jenny Lind's singing was a disappointment to some listeners, including John L. Marling, the young and promising editor of the *Nashville Daily Gazette*.<sup>60</sup> The fame of Jenny Lind's *Bird Song* had gone before her and perhaps certain members of her audience expected too much. At any rate, according to Marling, the entire audience was disappointed with the *Bird Song* and also with her rendering of *Home Sweet Home*. It was believed that the Swedish singer was incapable of injecting enough sentiment into her voice to please an American and especially a Southern audience.<sup>61</sup>

And so the Swedish songbird came, sang, but did not completely conquer her Nashville audience. A study of the period reveals the fact that Nashville audiences never docilely accepted the entertainment presented to them. Hence the criticism of Jenny Lind was not exceptional. Other artists and artistic productions were forced to run the gauntlet of the city's critics. The first eagerly awaited operatic production was not to escape without its share of brickbats.

While operatic selections had been presented in Nashville before 1850, the first full production of an opera occurred on May 26, 1854. On that date Signor Luigi Arditi's Italian Opera Company opened with Gaetano Donizetti's *Lucia di Lammermoor*.<sup>62</sup> Although a large audience

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.* The entire tour consisted of 95 concerts and brought in \$712,161.34. Jenny Lind received \$176,675.09. *Ibid.*, 354.

<sup>58</sup> *Nashville Daily Gazette*, April 2, 1851.

<sup>59</sup> Thomas, *Old Days in Nashville*, 62.

<sup>60</sup> *Nashville Daily Gazette*, April 2, 1851.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

filled the *Adelphi* to see and hear this most popular of Donizetti's compositions, it seems that many of the patrons did not understand opera technique. For this reason, their introduction to the art was not entirely satisfactory,<sup>63</sup> and the brilliant recitations and arias for the soprano (Lucia) in the Mad Scene (Act III) were not really appreciated or understood. Because of this, the Nashville *Gazette* assumed the rôle of teacher and gave its subscribers instruction in opera appreciation.<sup>64</sup>

The *Gazette* readily understood this lack of understanding on the part of the Nashville audience. To the uninitiated, the mad scene seemed overdrawn and unnatural as Lucia, although demented, sang without hesitation passages that would be difficult for a sane person. The explanation, of course, was simple. Donizetti ignored dramatic plausibility in order to create a musical sensation.<sup>65</sup> But the Nashville audience was blissfully unaware of the composer's original intentions.

In addition to *Lucia di Lammermoor*, Ardita's company presented Donizetti's *Lucretia Borgia*, Rossini's *Barber of Seville*, and Bellini's *Norma*. Of these operas, *Norma* was received with the greatest acclaim in Nashville. The romantic story of this opera is rich in symbolism, sentiment, mother love, and sacrifice—qualities that made it peculiarly appropriate for a Southern audience. The charming musical score had more appeal than the brilliantly technical passages in *Lucia*.

The Nashville critics, having had their say with respect to Jenny Lind and the opera company, now sharpened their pens and waited for the arrival of Edwin Booth. He began his engagement in Nashville on March 8, 1859, and played to capacity houses for two weeks. At this time he was only twenty-six years old, "a slight, pale youth, with black, flowing hair, soft brown eyes full of tenderness and gentle timidity, a manner mixed with shyness and quiet repose."<sup>66</sup>

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, May 26, 28, 1854.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, May 30, 1854.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>66</sup> Brander Matthews and Laurence Hutton, *The Life and Art of Edwin Booth and his Contemporaries* (Boston, 1886), 62. See, also, Clara Morris, *Life on the Stage* (New York, 1901), 162; Mrs. John Drew, *Autobiographical Sketch* (New York, 1899), 113-14.

Booth, of course, was to become one of the famous Hamlets of the nineteenth century. Nature gave to him the melancholy, romantic face, the graceful carriage, the poetic temperament, and the genius necessary for a masterful interpretation of Shakespeare's most famous character. He was able with delicate, subtle effects of the voice, eyes, and gestures to indicate the agonized unrest that Hamlet experienced.

When Booth presented Hamlet in Nashville, March 9, 1859, less than two years had gone by since he had first assumed the part at the Metropolitan Theater in New York. But in spite of his youth, there is no doubt that he presented to his Nashville public the most polished Hamlet it had ever witnessed.<sup>67</sup> However, certain members of the audience were interested neither in Hamlet nor in Booth and talked so loud that both patrons and actors were embarrassed. On several occasions, too, the star's supporting cast proved to be weak, and this tended to spoil an otherwise flawless production.

It is interesting to note that the editor of the Nashville *Daily News* did not quite approve of some of Booth's original touches. He thought the actor had taken too many liberties with the original drama and was of the opinion that "Shakespeare knew the nature of his gifts, and refrained from high aspirations as an actor. Mr. Booth and other great actors, should, in imitation of his sagacity, refrain from attempting dramatic composition. Every man within his own sphere."<sup>68</sup>

In addition to opera and drama, the people of Nashville gave liberal support to minstrel shows. The importance of minstrelsy as an element of American culture has never been fully appreciated. From the historical point of view the minstrel is important because it represents a form of entertainment developed by Americans from materials found on American soil. "It is the only branch of the dramatic art," observed Laurence Hutton in 1889, "which has had its origin in this country, while the melody it has inspired is certainly our only approach to a national music."<sup>69</sup>

<sup>67</sup> Nashville *Daily News*, March 10, 1859.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>69</sup> Laurence Hutton, "The Negro on the Stage," in *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* (New York, 1850-), LXXIX (1889), 133.

Throughout the fifties, Nashville was visited several times a year by numerous minstrel companies. Mat Peel's Campbell Minstrels was considered the best and it does appear that this troupe possessed more real talent than any other which performed in the city.<sup>70</sup> Peel's minstrels reached the high-water mark of their popularity in 1857. They began an engagement of several weeks in Nashville on March 23, and according to the press accounts the theater had never been so densely crowded, not even when Jenny Lind had been the chief attraction. Not for one night, or two nights, but night after night for over a week the house was "crammed from pit to dome without any abatement in appreciation or enthusiasm."<sup>71</sup>

The Campbells were not so well received, however, when they returned in 1858. On that occasion, the *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig* asserted that "The days of the glory of Negro Minstrelsy are well nigh passed."<sup>72</sup> It does not seem possible that such a popular form of entertainment should lose its appeal in a year's time. Perhaps the change was due to the intensified sectional feeling. Because of the tense situation and strained emotions, even the innocent minstrels suffered as they tended to exploit an institution that had created the bitterness between North and South.

But Nashville did not depend entirely on professional actors, singers, and minstrel men for its amusements. Among the citizens of the city there were to be found numerous persons who possessed considerable musical or dramatic ability although they lacked professional experience. From time to time these gifted amateurs gave concerts, tableaux, or plays, usually for the sake of charity, but occasionally for the aesthetic pleasure such entertainment afforded.

It would seem that amateur talent expressed itself more frequently and to better advantage musically than it did dramatically. The press encouraged amateur singers and musicians and urged the people to patronize the amateur concerts. It was believed that such performances

<sup>70</sup> Nashville *Daily Union and American*, March 24, 1857.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, April 3, 1857.

<sup>72</sup> *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*, January 3, 1858.



tended to cultivate and to extend the musical talents of the people and to elevate and refine the moral and intellectual tone of society.

One of the most pretentious charity concerts to be given in Nashville took place in the Hall of Representatives on January 20, 1858.<sup>73</sup> The company consisted of a full chorus and piano, violin, and vocal soloists. The large audience was "frantic with admiration and delight. . . . No better evidence of the superior quality of music, and of its pleasing effect upon the audience could be given, than the fact that nearly every piece on the programme was encored, and some of them two or three times."<sup>74</sup>

The most spectacular type of entertainment sponsored by the social workers of Nashville was the tableau, usually given in a series in order to provide entertainment for several hours. One of the most successful tableaux was presented on January 15, 1858, by the managers of the Protestant Orphans Asylum. The demand for tickets was so great that the entire program was repeated several times.<sup>75</sup> The performance opened with a fairy scene in which there appeared "a group of lovely little girls, beautifully dressed, and looking so unearthly in their simplicity and innocence that we should have scarcely been surprised had they really spread their wings and flown away to the land of fairies."<sup>76</sup> A humorous tableau was entitled "Married Life in Two Scenes." The first scene was the day after marriage and the second scene was the day after the honeymoon. This was followed by "Zuleika in the Bride of Abydos" and "The Swiss Girl Pining for Home." In the latter, "the very poetry of grief was portrayed in her graceful form, her slightly drooping head, and pensive look. The effect was magical."<sup>77</sup> The first part of the program ended with a comic feature entitled "The Old Maids' Tea Party." The second half opened with two beautiful scenes from *Ivanhoe*, featuring Rowena and Rebecca. The last tableau on the program was entitled "The Slave Market" and consisted of "all the

<sup>73</sup> John Berrien Lindsley, *Diary* (MS. in possession of Mr. J. E. Windrow, Nashville), January 20, 1858.

<sup>74</sup> *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*, January 22, 1858.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, January 12, 15, 17, 20, 21, 1858; Lindsley, *Diary*, January 18, 1858.

<sup>76</sup> *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*, January 17, 1858.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*

dazzling glories of nearly all the preceding tableaux . . . collected into one grand and glorious group, thus forming a fitting finale to so beautiful an exhibition.”<sup>78</sup>

The tableau, staged with such artistry, became a thing of beauty and was indicative of the good taste that was prevalent in Nashville society during the period. As has been shown above, this ability to appreciate the cultural things of life was reflected in the theater, the opera, the ball room, the concert hall, and the university class room. Also it has been revealed that the people not only appreciated, they produced. This was true with respect to the tableau—an indication not only of appreciation but of creative ability as well. The field of literature, which remains to be considered, exhibited the same characteristics.

A study of the fifties discloses the fact that there was considerable literary activity in Nashville and that the city was a part of the world of letters. In domestic and foreign markets Nashville book dealers purchased standard and de luxe editions of classical and popular literature to meet the demands of their customers. On the other hand, journals and books published in Nashville had a wide circulation in the Southwest. By 1850 Nashville was recognized as one of the important publishing centers of the country.<sup>79</sup>

Many of the authors and poets of the period have become literary ghosts, their names forgotten, and their works either lost or buried in the pages of old periodicals. This was “the fleeting literature of the press, the forum, the lyceum, or the Association which . . . will warble for a moment, and then perish forever.”<sup>80</sup>

With respect to the writers associated with the Nashville scene, the poems of Virginia French and Clara Cole may be taken as an index to Nashville literary talent. Mrs. Clara Marling Cole was one of the most prolific and certainly the most popular of Nashville’s poets. Practically nothing is known about her life except that she had many misfortunes, was married several times, and was the mother of John Leake Marling,

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>79</sup> *Nashville Directory*, I (1853), vii.

<sup>80</sup> J. Quitman Moore, “American Letters,” in *De Bow’s Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), XXVIII (1860), 663.

the Nashville journalist and editor. Her poems appeared again and again in the Nashville papers and periodicals and finally, due to the entreaties of her friends and admirers, she published in 1861 a collection of her verse under the title of *Clara's Poems*.<sup>81</sup> Clara was not a poetic genius but she was a pleasing versifier and possessed poetic instincts and interests. What her contemporaries regarded as the better features of her poems—"Morality, and a prevailing tone of religious effect"—become tiresome today. But Clara was simply one of many Southern writers who wrote "with no intention of publishing, but merely to gratify their instincts."<sup>82</sup>

As a poet, Lucy Virginia Smith French (1825-1881) was ranked above Clara Cole by contemporary critics and their judgment in this respect was sound. Although she never claimed Nashville as her home, she was so closely connected with its literary publications that she was definitely a part of the literary life of the city. An examination of her poems discloses the fact that Virginia French was influenced by Poe, by Byron, and possibly by Bryant. The poem "Leonore," which was included in the 1856 edition of her poems, suggests Poe from the title to the last line. The poem is ragged and inartistic and might have been an expression of Virginia's wit. But whether she intended it to be serious or humorous is of no real consequence as in either case the poem remains a literary curiosity.<sup>83</sup>

In considering the works of Clara Cole and Virginia French, it is necessary to remember the pleasure their poems gave to their contemporaries. In this respect they were worth-while contributions. Of the two poets, Virginia French reflects more of the life of the time. Her poems are more tangible and less morbid than Clara Cole's. Neither Mrs. French nor Mrs. Cole mastered the technique of verse writing. Both, as a matter of fact, were more or less indifferent to form technicalities.

<sup>81</sup> Nashville *Patriot*, February 11, 1860; Mary Tardy, *Southland Writers*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1870), II, 718-21; Clara Cole, *Clara's Poems* (Philadelphia, 1861), preface and introduction, *passim*.

<sup>82</sup> Edward Ingle, *Southern Sidelights* (Boston, 1896), 198; Tardy, *Southland Writers*, II, 718; Cole, *Clara's Poems*, preface and introduction, *passim*.

<sup>83</sup> L. Virginia French, *Wind-Whispers* (Philadelphia, 1856), 77-79.

Clara had only a few themes—and her longing for heaven dominated her work. Virginia French had a wider range, was closer to life, but was imbued with the romanticism of the period. The shadow of the inevitable conflict did not touch Clara at all, but it did influence the later work of Virginia French.

Of the literary magazines that were published in Nashville during this decade, the *Southern Lady's Companion* and the *Parlor Visitor* may be considered as typical. The *Southern Lady's Companion* is important historically because it was a pioneer, and a comparatively successful one, in its field. It is said that it was the first journal designed especially for the entertainment of the women of the South.<sup>84</sup> The editorial policy of the *Companion* was expressed briefly by the editor, Reverend M. M. Henkle. "Whenever we can have a supply of good original matter," he announced, "it will be preferred to selections of equal value; but we think a good selection better than an inferior original article, and shall act on that decision."<sup>85</sup> An examination of the available surviving numbers of the magazine leaves the impression that Henkle was frequently injudicious in his selection of material. Many of the contributions were thinly treated articles regarding religion, morals and manners, domestic relations, and bad habits, such as snuff dipping.<sup>86</sup>

In many respects the *Parlor Visitor* resembled the *Southern Lady's Companion*. The editor, B. W. P. Jones, was opposed to dancing, the theater, fiction reading, and hard liquors. Jones was narrow in his views, but apparently sincere. He thought that his magazine was a moral guide for the people of Tennessee. Perhaps it was, but the *Parlor Visitor*, the *Southern Lady's Companion*, and many other Southern magazines might have enjoyed more permanent success had the editors given less attention to morality and more attention to good literature.

It is difficult to estimate the importance of the literature associated with the Nashville scene. Perhaps it should not be judged as literature

<sup>84</sup> *Southern Lady's Companion* (Nashville, 1847-1854), V (1851), 367.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, II (1847), 24.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, V (1851), 313-16.

at all, but simply as historical source material that reflects certain aspects of the Nashville mind and the Southern mind.

So far as Nashville periodicals are concerned, the mere fact that they existed is significant. They were symbolic in the sense that they represented a desire for a native literature. They attempted to fill a cultural gap that a less civilized people would not have noticed. It may be claimed that the Nashville periodicals were the products of the literary war between the opponents and defenders of the institution of slavery, that they represented a journalistic manifestation of the Southern desire for independence. Perhaps, they were, but there is no evidence to prove it. It should be borne in mind that in the middle of the nineteenth century almost every country town had a publication of some sort—either newspaper or magazine. Nashville, by 1850, was more than a country town—it was an educational center possessing many of the attributes of cultured society. Consequently, it would seem more logical to believe that Nashville periodicals, instead of being a direct result of the sectional controversy, actually owed their existence to the stimulating educational atmosphere which had already given the city the title “Athens of the South.”

# Notes and Documents

## BOYCE-HAMMOND CORRESPONDENCE

*Edited by* ROSSER H. TAYLOR

Of the many critics of Jefferson Davis in his capacity as president of the Confederate States of America, perhaps none was more bitter and persistent than William W. Boyce, member of the Confederate Congress from Winnsboro, South Carolina.<sup>1</sup> Doubtful of the success of the Confederacy from the beginning, Boyce seized every plausible opportunity to bring the warring sections to terms. So active was he in promoting peace conventions that many of his colleagues distrusted his motives. He was accused of morally deserting the Confederacy. With every shred of confidence in Davis and in the ultimate success of the Confederacy dashed by 1864, Boyce urged President Davis in an open letter to call a convention of all the states to formulate peace terms.<sup>2</sup> He argued that unless the South yielded immediately she would have to endure for an indefinite period a galling military despotism.<sup>3</sup>

James H. Hammond, living in retirement at Redcliffe, shared Boyce's dislike and distrust of Davis and felt keenly the lack of energy and wisdom in the conduct of the war. Notwithstanding, he made enormous personal sacrifices for the Confederacy. Apparently he never entirely lost hope. He died, however, just before the conclusion of the war with

<sup>1</sup> William W. Boyce was born in Charleston, South Carolina, October 24, 1818. He attended the South Carolina College and the University of Virginia. Upon the completion of the law course at the University of Virginia, Boyce practiced law at Winnsboro, South Carolina, and achieved prominence in his profession. He was a member of the national House of Representatives from March 4, 1853, to December 21, 1860; delegate for South Carolina to the Confederate Provisional Congress in 1861; member of the first and second Confederate Congresses, 1862-1864.

<sup>2</sup> David D. Wallace, *The History of South Carolina*, 4 vols. (New York, 1934), III, 201.

<sup>3</sup> Nathaniel W. Stephenson, *The Day of the Confederacy* (New Haven, 1920), 175.

the parting instruction to his son to have a furrow ploughed over his grave if the Yankees emerged victorious.<sup>4</sup>

Redcliffe, S. C., 17th. March, 1862.

My Dear Boyce: We have just received the news of the fall of New Madrid<sup>5</sup> & of Newbern<sup>6</sup> & the general advance of the enemy. Under your late act to burn the cotton & tobacco<sup>7</sup> you order the assessors of your Confederate War Tax to assess the value on the quantity of cotton & tobacco in their respective districts & to burn them immediately, leaving it to our Government to make suitable compensation hereafter as it can. Place an embargo on these two articles & on naval stores & rice & make the penalty death to any one who attempts to export them. Impeach Jeff Davis for incompetency & call a convention of the States. Ad interim make Floyd<sup>8</sup> or Price<sup>9</sup> or Toombs<sup>10</sup> Dictator. West Point is death to us & sick Presidents & Generals are equally fatal. We want men *sana mens in sano corpore* & with common sense at that.

Yours truly, J. H. Hammond

P. S. I have 200,000 pounds of cotton fixed to be burnt. Cut the dykes at once.<sup>11</sup>

Richmond, March 17, '62.

My Dear Governor: It was a source of great gratification to me to receive your letters. I was very anxious to learn your opinions on the present condition of affairs.

Things are in a very gloomy state. I think you are even too hopeful. Is not Maryland gone? Is not Kentucky gone? Is not Missouri gone? And is not Tennessee slipping from our grasp? And Virginia, is she not in a precarious

<sup>4</sup> Elizabeth Merritt, "James Henry Hammond, 1807-1864," Johns Hopkins University *Studies in Historical and Political Science* (Baltimore, 1883-), XLI (1923), 146.

<sup>5</sup> New Madrid, Missouri, captured by General John Pope, March, 1862.

<sup>6</sup> Newbern, North Carolina, captured by the Federals under General A. E. Burnside, March, 1862.

<sup>7</sup> In order to prevent the seizure of cotton and tobacco by the Federal soldiers, the Confederate Congress, March 17, 1862, enacted a law which provided for the destruction of cotton and tobacco when those products were in the least danger of seizure by the enemy. About the same time, by joint resolution, the Confederate Congress restricted cotton acreage for 1862. See Frank L. Owsley, *King Cotton Diplomacy* (Chicago, 1931), 47.

<sup>8</sup> John B. Floyd (1806-1863), governor of Virginia, secretary of war under Buchanan, and Confederate general. After he abandoned Fort Donelson, Floyd was in high disfavor with President Davis.

<sup>9</sup> Doubtless Sterling Price (1809-1867), governor of Missouri and an ardent secessionist. He was hostile to Davis and was accused of wishing to replace him as president of the Confederacy.

<sup>10</sup> Robert Toombs (1810-1885), United States senator from Georgia and secretary of state of the Confederate States of America. Toombs was a severe critic of Davis whom he heartily despised.

<sup>11</sup> N.B. on back of this letter: "Copy to W. W. Boyce 1862 (not sent)."

condition? It seems evident that the army of the Potomac will be obliged [*sic*] to fall back to the line of rail road from Gordonsville to Stanton [*sic*]. Can that army protect Richmond? I doubt it. If Richmond is abandoned then another step backwards & we are out of Virginia. Then the war is thrown exclusively upon the cotton states. Can they maintain it successfully? Can they carry our army victorious to Mason & Dixon's line? I don't see how they can. Suppose then the cotton States after immense sacrifices & the most heroic exertions hold their own and extort their independence from the North? What is the prospect before us? Is it a permanent peace? It seems not to me. It rather appears to be a reprove [*sic*]. For the North with the border slave states (these latter gradually but certainly northernized) will be too strong for the cotton states' Confederacy. On some suitable pretext another war is hatched and then what? It seems to me the prospect is very gloomy.

I have all along thought that the failure to get the whole South would render the revolution a failure. Our policy was to have occupied the border slave states at the beginning. Thus to have encouraged our friends and awed our enemies. At the beginning the North was unprepared. We were then stronger than we are now, for we had more confidence & enthusiasm. Instead of advancing boldly we paused in Virginia on the Kentucky line & at the threshold of Missouri. The enemy then began in earnest their gigantic preparations. When they were thoroughly ready they commenced the onslaught. And of course we were beaten. It was a mere mathematical calculation. They ascertained how many men & guns we had at a given point, and made the attack with double the number. Of course we had to be defeated. Davis has no military genius. And our army movements have been conducted in the most languid manner. While the enemy were exhibiting revolutionary energy we were doing nothing. Mr. Davis with his West Point red tape has tranquilly measured the brief hours of our prosperity. "Oh the pity of it, Iago, the pity of it." I have one very great satisfaction that I never thought Davis was the man. The worst of it is, that there seems to be no attainable remedy. Davis is puffed up with his own conceit, and looks upon an independent opinion as an attack upon him. Common sense he considers treason and to doubt his infalibility [*sic*] is *lese majeste*. We have fallen upon evil times. The immense patronage of the Executive renders many of the Congress servile. And I fear there is no likelihood of a decided course. There is every chance that we will be Davis-ized into nothing. I frankly confess to you my spirits are down at zero. If the enemy have the sagacity to treat the conquered States with gentleness we will find ourselves getting weaker every day. Do write me as often as you can conveniently.

When I return home I will try to pay you a visit. I would like to talk freely with you. Mrs. Boyce and daughters are at home.

Present me kindly to your family.

I wish indeed we had you here.

Your friend, Wm. W. Boyce



Richmond, April 4th, '62.

My Dear Governor: I hasten to reply to yours just received. I am glad to find you are in good spirits. The difficulty I see is this. If we make peace losing Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, the mountains of Virginia & East Tennessee, then we only get a reprieve. The war will begin in a few years & we will be too weak for the North.

Now I ask you what chance do we stand of getting the above-named States & parts of States? If we could have the very best of management in our war matters, it would be immensely difficult for us to get possession of the Southern States we have lost. But I do not expect such good management. I expect the same system under which we have already lost so much. If we could have an efficient war administration I might then share in your confidence. But I see no substantial ground to expect anything except Jef. Davis. Jef Davis has brought us to the brink of ruin and I can't see how having lost the game when he held all the trumps, he is to win when the enemy hold all the leading cards. I consider that we are in imminent danger of being driven out of Tennessee & Virginia, if that takes place we will lose in a large degree the power of those States in the struggle. You must make allowances for the discouragement which follows disasters, the conciliatory policy of the enemy, the scarcity of machinery and the materials of war. The Yankees are so deeply in that they must go on. For a long time the English ministry used confidently to proclaim in the French revolution that the French Government must break down. Indeed the French assignats went to nothing, but the French armies went to every capital in Europe to which there was a road. That we may even under Davis' management make a protracted struggle even when driven to the cotton states is very probable. But a great successful revolution by which all the Southern States are to be united together in one Government, that is the difficulty. It is of this I am so despondent. However time will show, as Ritchie<sup>12</sup> used to say, *nous verrons*, we shall see what we shall see. The only way that I see by which we might save the country would be to supersede Davis, to establish a provisional Government of the ablest men of each State, for them to have absolute powers, and to appoint the ablest man to conduct the war, with the power of remand if he proved incompetent.

I assure you that under the present regime you are in far more danger than you think. I wish I could agree with you about the non-exportation of cotton. I think that idea is played out. We need expect nothing from Europe unless after some successes we could *buy* Louis Napoleon. Remember me kindly to your family. As ever

Sincerely your friend, Wm. W. Boyce.

P. S.—Sr. Gwin<sup>13</sup> has just arrived from Washington. He says the enemy have

<sup>12</sup> Doubtless Thomas Ritchie (1778-1854), editor of the Richmond *Enquirer* until 1845 when he became editor of the *Washington Union*.

<sup>13</sup> Ex-Senator William M. Gwin of California (1805-1885). Gwin, whose sympathies were with the Confederates, was arrested in 1861 on a charge of disloyalty to the Union

sent a large army to Fortress Monroe. I think they intend an early movement on Richmond. I am told that the fortifications of Richmond are very poor. What do you think of the conscription proposed by Mr. Davis? I do not see the necessity for it. I think the States would furnish their quotas. The States may use the conscription if they wish. P. S. I have written very freely to you, of course I beg you to keep my ideas to yourself. Do write.

Richmond, April 12th. 1862.

My Dear Governor: It is refreshing to read such a hopeful letter as you wrote. You can sleep sounder on the edge of a precipice than anyone I have lately communicated with. You should have lived at the foot of Mount Vesuvius. You would never be disturbed at the possibility of an eruption, though the crater was smoking like the chimnies [*sic*] of ten thousand steam-boats.

I assure you that things are in a more critical condition than you imagine. The forces under Beauregard are much less than you think, and our military strength is generally much less than you suppose.

However, I will let the future disclose itself. I only hope that you may prove to be a better reader of that inscrutable future than I am. You do not make sufficient allowance for the incredible incompetency of our Executive.

I think a battle cannot long be avoided at Yorktown. The enemies' forces there are at the lowest computation double those of our own opposed to them. McClellan is said to be in command there.

By the by, I saw Senator Gwin of California a few evenings since. He represents everything in the most favorable light for us. He says the Washington Government is about to break down, that the Yankees cannot stand the expense much longer, that if they meet with any disasters an immense peace party will immediately spring up, etc. He says [Charles] Sumner & [Henry] Wilson have the swing at Washington, that the Republican rulers are determined on the most ferocious treatment of the politicians of the South, death by the rope and confiscation are all they have to hope for. I am afraid my dear Governor, if we go under your famous "mud sill" sentiment will rise in judgment against you.

I learn that Jef Davis is very serious and Madame is in despair. Genl. Lee<sup>14</sup> & Genl. Cooper<sup>15</sup> I learn have sent their families away. We learn that a terrible

and placed in prison at Fort Lafayette. He was released on December 2, 1861. Just how he employed his talents from the time he was released from prison until he went to France in 1863 the editor has been unable to learn. It appears from the Boyce letters that he passed through the military lines en route from Washington to Richmond in April, 1862. Doubtless a master's thesis in the library of the University of California by Helen H. Blattner on "The Political Career of William M. Gwin" throws light upon Gwin's activity in 1862. The editor, however, has been unable to procure a copy of the manuscript.

<sup>14</sup> Probably General Robert E. Lee.

<sup>15</sup> Samuel Cooper (1798-1876), senior officer of the Confederate army. He served as adjutant and inspector general.

fight is now going on near Yorktown. . . . Is it not the strangest thing in the world that the President has no troops ready to take the place of the 10 months volunteers. We have constantly been told that there was no difficulty in getting men, the only trouble was in getting arms. If Davis had tried to destroy us he could not have taken a more effective course than he has. I cannot believe he is treacherous, I can only suppose he is totally incompetent. Present me to Mrs. Hammond & Betty. I may take you by surprise with a visit some of these times.

With kindest wishes, Your friend Wm. W. Boyce

However, you will have the news by intelligence despatch sooner than you can get my letter.

Richmond, April 15th, '63.

My Dear Gov.: I communicated your passage about Judge Lyons<sup>16</sup> to his father who was very proud to make it known to his son.

The point about direct taxes is this: the Constitution says direct taxes & representation shall be apportioned according to population in estimating which 3/5th. of the slaves only shall be counted.<sup>17</sup> The Supreme Court of the U. S. held that direct taxes embraced land & the Constitution expressly enumerates a capitation tax as a direct tax. In the Federal Constitution slaves are treated as persons. Now according to the Constitution slaves & lands in a State are to pay such a tax as the population warrants counting 3/5 of the slaves. But the Tennessee & such like members overrule this clause of the constitution and insist that slaves & lands shall pay the same ad valorem duty or tax in every State. I hope I have made myself understood.

I have just seen a very intelligent prisoner just returned from the North. He brings a message from a leading man of the North West to the effect that the leaders of the peace party desire peace on the basis of the independence of the South, that they talk reconstruction to get votes, that our newspapers & public men should not denounce the peace party North & swear they won't reconstruct, that if they would be descript [*sic*] the war might be ended & then they could decline reconstruction.

That the violence of some of our papers damaged the peace movement North. It is very difficult to learn what is the policy of the Administration on this point, indeed whether they have any policy except to "shut their eyes & fight on."

The tax bill<sup>18</sup> is now in the hands of the committee of conference. I think they will agree on the Senate amendment substantially.

I think we will adjourn by the first of May. I am very anxious to get away from here. The means of living are very limited here. I would like exceedingly

<sup>16</sup> Identity unknown.

<sup>17</sup> Confederate Constitution, Art. I, sec. 3.

<sup>18</sup> An act to provide new revenues through a tax in kind, passed April 24, 1863.

to see you, and talk over the great questions involved in our present condition in all their length & breath [*sic*].

Please remember me kindly to Mrs. H. and your little daughter.

With kindest wishes, Sincerely your friend William W. Boyce

Winnsboro, S. C., Oct. 5th. '64.

My Dear Governor: It is sometime since I had the pleasure of hearing from you. I would like very much to know what you think of "the situation" now, and what policy ought to be adopted. It looks to me like we are going under the Jeff Davis lead very fast over the precipice. His intermeddling with the armies is usually disastrous, and he has no diplomacy. I don't see how we can come out without ruin if the matter is left entirely to Davis and Lincoln. I have always thought Davis should have brought every point of diplomacy into play to build up the opposition party North. Surely any change is for the better. I wish you would give me your views. Indeed I wish you would give them to your country. No one enjoys a greater reputation for statesmanship than you do. Yours would be a "voice potential" if you would raise it. Ought you not to come to the aid of your perishing country? The Achilles of Homer did not always sleep in his tent. Should not our Achilles bestir himself? Give us a great state paper. Forget everything but a country dying from the incompetency of its presumptuous chief. Come into the arena and be the great pacificator. If the war goes on we are ruined. We lose both slavery and freedom. Another campaign and the social system of the South; broken up, and despair will settle in every heart. Before it is too late, let us have your counsels. If all cannot be saved, save what you can from the wreck. I hope you will take your pen in hand and lighten the path for us to follow. I have just received a letter from a very intelligent gentleman, who asks, "What does Govr. Hammond think?" Davis & *ici omne genies* are pretty well played out, the country is tired of the sin. Now we need you. May we not hear from you.

My family are all well. Minnie married Mr. Robert M. DuBose of this district. He is in the army at Richmond and we are very uneasy about him. I do not know anything that would give me more pleasure than to meet you again. Mrs. Boyce and myself beg to be remembered to Mrs. Hammond and Betty.

Your attached friend, Wm. W. Boyce

## Book Reviews

*The Old South: The geographical, economic, social, political and cultural expansion, institutions, and nationalism of the ante-bellum South.* By R. S. Cotterill. (Glendale, California: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1936. Pp. 354. Maps, charts, bibliography. \$4.00.)

This treatise marks an effort to meet a very definite need in the literature of American sectionalism. Conceived in the broadest possible sense, it covers in scope every phase of development of the ante-bellum South. In a series of unnumbered sections and chapters it analyzes the "Southern Background," tells the story of the "Expansion of the South," discusses at length the "Development of Southern Nationalism," interprets the "Culture of the Old South," and, finally, in a brief chapter summarizes the "Struggle for Independence." The whole is a well rounded narrative, told with clarity, though without especial sparkle or distinction.

One is surprised that all this can be accomplished within the brief space of 331 pages. There is, to be sure, no pretense to monographic fullness and the bibliography suggests a very limited use of even basic source material. The reviewer cannot but feel that a more extensive selection of colorful illustrative material would have added to the vividness and interest of the narrative.

When, moreover, one looks under the surface he finds many sacrifices that the even flow of the story within such drastic limits requires. One may, perhaps, question the wisdom of devoting twenty precious pages to the Indians, as the "oldest inhabitants" of this area, especially since this part of the narrative suggests relatively little significance for the development of the region by its later occupants. The account of the "colonial foundation," of the "expansion of the tobacco country," and of the "rise of the cotton kingdom" is largely the story of westward expansion, important enough in itself, but probably overemphasized in a volume which has no place for the consideration of the peculiar political and constitutional theories of the South, for the Southern proslavery argument, and for many other topics. There is no consideration of the units of local government that developed south of the Mason and Dixon line; Bacon's rebellion is referred to casually only as one of the uprisings that reflected Western discontent with Eastern rule; party alignment is disposed of so briefly as to give the impression that there was never any Whig strength in South Carolina. Even an excellent chapter summarizing the internal sectionalism within the Old South does not make up for these and other shortcomings. At every turn one is im-

pressed with what the author is unable to say in his narrative. The brief treatment of the Georgia convention of 1850 does not even mention by name the "Georgia platform," with all its convenience as a formula. Nothing on religious development worth indexing has been included in the text.

And so one might go on. It should be sufficient, however, to point out that the concluding chapter, "The Struggle for Independence," gives little more space to the Southern Confederacy than a standard college textbook in American history. The bibliography is also somewhat curtailed, without an indication that it is intended to be selective. Important monographs and monographic articles by Boucher, Boyd, Van Deusen, and a number of others are not listed. The reviewer still doubts his careful check which failed to reveal reference to *The South in the Building of the Nation*.

Western Reserve University

ARTHUR C. COLE

*A History of the South, 1607-1936.* By William B. Hesseltine. (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1936. Pp. xiii, 748. \$3.75.)

Professor Hesseltine has rightly proceeded upon the theory that the history of the South cannot be written apart from that of the whole country. He has thus avoided a mere study of conditions, so far as the Old South is concerned. Unfortunately, this cannot be said for his treatment of the New South. All in all, the work is admirable, though in some respects it falls short of expectations.

Dr. Hesseltine treats the economic, social, political, and cultural aspects of Southern life and their relation with the national life with a fine sense of balance. He devotes a minimum of space to the details of well-known facts, and so frees his pages for more interpretative material. He writes with force, and his book will make a distinct impression on the student mind. He devotes 112 pages to the Colonial period and a like number to the era from the beginning of the Revolution to the inception of the slavery controversy. Developments from that point to 1861 fill 221 pages, while the Confederacy and Reconstruction claim 200 more. The New South receives a scant 74 pages. Excellent selected bibliographies follow each chapter.

A penchant for strong generalization has led to many statements that raise questions. For example: did the forests of the entire South consist of white and yellow pine (p. 3)? Is it "mostly to the credit of the Negro" that good relations existed between the races (p. 51)? Did the national government assume certain debts of Virginia when Jefferson was president (p. 126)? Did the collapse of the Whigs break "the last tie which held the Union together" (p. 298)?

If the book has one central theme, it is the dominance of the planter aristocracy in the South. This is an old idea but may be questioned. What distinguished the aristocracy from the unaristocratic or the planter from the farmer? The Democratic party was that of the masses (p. 295) and three fourths of the

slaveowners were Whigs (pp. 297-98), but the Whigs never dominated the South. "Long generations of subservience to the master class in the Old South had made the poor white docile" (p. 658). Yet the greater part of the Old South was never more than two generations from the frontier.

Two things consolidated the Southerners for slavery: "the growing profitability of slavery and the fear of the rising Jacksonian Democracy" (p. 249). Apparently abolitionist activities had nothing to do with the case. Calhoun and the "Southern-controlled Senate" scrapped the Missouri Compromise by opposing the organization of Oregon under the principles of the Northwest Ordinance (pp. 351-52). One would not suspect, from the author's discussion, that the two principles were not identical or that the Wilmot Proviso might have influenced the Southerners. Nor does he mention that the Senate, in 1848, approved an Oregon bill with what Professor Hockett calls "an adroitly conceived amendment" extending the Missouri Compromise line. In Kansas "Men of antislavery sentiments were driven out of the proslavery settlements" (p. 384). What happened to proslavery men in antislavery settlements? "Border Ruffians" appear five times while "Beecher's Bibles" appear but once (pp. 382 ff.). Proslavery elections were fraudulent while those of the free-state men were untainted. The slavery controversy takes on that old appearance of a struggle between the righteous against the unrighteous.

The treatment of the New South is entirely too sketchy and smacks too much of a sociologist's report. This is but natural, however, for the writings in the field are too frequently of that character and too seldom the findings of sound historical research. Yet one must raise a few questions. Is it correct to hold the tradition of Robert E. Lee responsible for the South's industrial system (p. 648)? Can the Davis tradition be held responsible for efforts "to keep the niggers in their places," when the author elsewhere rightly attributes this to the nonslaveholding whites and their descendants? Certainly the Davis tradition would not explain the Californian's attitude toward the yellow race. The "Bourbons" are blamed for nearly everything in the New South that is unsatisfactory, but the reader becomes confused as to who the "Bourbons" were.

Professor Hesseltine looks upon Southern members of Congress as negative characters (p. 695). It would seem necessary to know more of how these men stood on such questions as currency, credit and banking, the tariff, railroad regulation, and monopoly control before a sound judgment is possible. He says that they opposed internal improvements and Federal aid to education. Yet the elder Senator Bankhead, thirty years ago, advocated the development of the Tennessee River along lines that strongly suggest the TVA. More than two thirds of the Southern senators supported the Blair Educational Bill between 1883 and 1888.

There are evidences of haste in the preparation of the book which are no doubt attributable to the printers. A few examples illustrate: Donalson for

Donelson (p. 193); Jonesborough for Jonesboro (p. 247); "the products . . . was . . ." (p. 343); "skalawags" for the generally used "scalawags" (p. 605), though the latter spelling is used on other pages.

It must not be assumed that such shortcomings as have been pointed out destroy the value of the book. They are comparatively few in a volume of such length. On the whole, it is a valuable contribution to an understanding of the South, and is well suited to its purpose—"a manual to meet the needs of students."

Vanderbilt University

DANIEL M. ROBISON

*Scientific Interests in the Old South.* By Thomas Cary Johnson, Jr. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936. Pp. vii, 217. \$2.50.)

Here is a new picture of the Old South. All the familiar actors have changed their parts. No one is concerned with politics or plantations; neither cotton nor the peculiar institution are so much as mentioned. Instead there are planters who vie with professors in the study of botany and geology; "sweet Southern girls" who rate a knowledge of natural philosophy among their chief "accomplishments"; and plain people who are "never sated with the wonders of science."

So this was the Old South! It is hard to believe, if one has assumed that this region nourished few interests save the economic and political, and that its cultural activities were limited to the making of wax flowers and the reading of Sir Walter Scott. Yet Professor Johnson, in refutation of this common tradition, shows that popular interest in the natural sciences was indeed widespread throughout the section. Not only were there certain centers, notably Charleston and New Orleans, in which original research of some importance was maintained, but the educated classes in general displayed considerable appreciation of "the New Science of the day." So far as this field was concerned, the Old South was not a region cut off from dynamic influences but one which shared the cultural life of the rest of the nation and of the Western World.

It is doubtful if we have so complete an account of the general interest in science for any other part of the country during this period. The presentation is at times obscured by the very mass of detail, which has been carefully collected from newspapers, college catalogues, and other sources. But the data are there, and further generalizations and comparisons are now made possible. Some of these are suggested in the author's "Conclusions"; for example, it is there observed that "the decaying deism of the South was a much more fertile [scientific] soil for a time than the insufficiently rotted Calvinism of New England." This is an interesting hypothesis but the comparisons necessary to substantiate it are not attempted.



Something remains to be done, also, before the underlying relations between scientific and other activities within the South itself are made clear. Was deism really the inspiring influence, or was it early Victorian romanticism? And, in either case, what of the amenities between science and religion—between geology and the Methodism of the masses?

Several criticisms of the study may be suggested. It is not certain that all authorities would rate as highly as does Professor Johnson, the more serious scientific research which occurred in the section. It is obvious, again, that much of the popular interest described was of a superficial character. But the author does not hold that there was anything profound about most of it. He only insists that the interest was there, and his detailed demonstration of this limited thesis is successful beyond question. The demonstration is all the more impressive for the fact, that both medicine and scientific agriculture—for which one might expect the greatest public appreciation—have been intentionally omitted from the narrative.

Professor Johnson has made a valuable beginning in presenting the scientific phase of popular culture in the nation as a whole, as well as in the South; and it is to be hoped that he and others will carry the story further.

Duke University

RICHARD H. SHRYOCK

*The African Background Outlined; Or Handbook for the Study of the Negro.*

By Carter G. Woodson. (Washington: The Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, Inc., 1936. Pp. viii, 478. Maps. \$3.25.)

Carter G. Woodson is well known as the editor of the *Journal of Negro History* and as an author whose list of contributions to the study of the Negro problem is already long. In his *Handbook* the author has attempted to give an idea of the historical background of the Negro in Africa, and likewise to give some notion of the part played by the Negro in European and American life. There are chapters on the education and religion of the Negro, and on the contribution of the Negro to American literature and to art.

Part I, dealing with African background, is an outline of the origins and general social, economic, and political career of the Negro peoples. The material is detailed and prosy, and suffers from a lack of interpretation, tending indeed to become a recital of battles, kingdoms, and empires which have little reality for the Western mind. Although accompanied by numerous maps, the regions and movements indicated are not clear to the casual observer, and are wasteful of effort when an attempt is made to orient the subregions with an ordinary map of Africa.

The impression is clear, however, that the Negro race has had a cultural past that is not without glory, indeed that in some instances it was not behind civilizations ordinarily credited with being well developed.

Part II develops the attitude of the world toward the Negro, and the reaction of the Negro to Western culture.

Perhaps the most significant assertion made is that, in spite of the contributions made to the exploitation and pioneering of the New World, the Negro does not enjoy the social justice that he feels should be his. Only in the field of religion does he control his institutional life. Neither in business nor in education nor yet in politics is he free to make himself heard with the effectiveness that he feels himself capable of. The fields of literature and art, however, are showing evidence of Negro genius. Negro folklore, folk songs, myths, and fables are rich in native wit and wisdom, and well repay study. From James Weldon Johnson to Countee Cullen and Stirling A. Brown, the Negro has won recognition as a poet. Booker T. Washington won recognition as an orator; W. E. B. Du Bois as a scholar and essayist; W. S. Brathwaite as a literary critic.

Native African art reveals upon investigation, an originality and happiness of expression, as well as an appreciation of the principles of design, not indebted to European models. In stone and wood, in ivory and in wax, in clay and in metals the Negro well expressed both his religion and the values of his daily life. His music, instrumental and vocal, unique and often of high quality, was strongly marked with a genius for rhythm and for accuracy of pitch. The Negro has not been behindhand in contributing to the arts of the Occidental World. This is especially true in the more emotional arts of music and the dance. But he has gone beyond these more primitive expressions. H. O. Tanner has distinguished himself as a painter; Sargent Johnson, Richmond Barthe, Elizabeth Prophet, and Augusta Savage have definite genius in sculpture.

It is a matter of regret that the author did not touch more at length upon the ability of the Negro as a craftsman. Excellent work has been done in stone, iron, and wood, as the present reviewer can testify from an examination of much slave artisanship. It should not be overlooked that many a course of closely laid and accurately leveled stone and brick wall and chimney, many a kitchen utensil and piece of plantation equipment, many a cradle and many a coffin were the work of African hands, and that African skilled slave labor gave an earnest of its skill in the prices it brought.

The book is not very useful as a handbook in the true sense of the word. The style is sometimes confusing and words are sometimes poorly used. A syllabus accompanying part of the text is more a confusion than a help. The whole book leaves an impression of need for more orderly arrangement. While well annotated, one wishes that the criticism of sources could have been fuller. With the exceptions noted, however, the book is still a contribution to the literature of the field and certainly contains a wealth of both obscure and timely information.

*Judicial Cases concerning American Slavery and the Negro.* Edited by Helen Tunnicliff Catterall with additions by James J. Hayden. Volume IV, *Cases from the Courts of New England, the Middle States, and the District of Columbia.* (Washington: The Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1936. Pp. xi, 586. \$2.75.)

Students of American history are well aware of the fact that the purpose of this series is to present a picture of American slavery as an institution in so far as it is exhibited in the printed reports of the courts of the United States and of the highest state courts. The recognition which the series has already attained is not only a monument to the patient scholarship and skill of Mrs. Catterall but also it is further evidence, if indeed such evidence is needed, of the immense historical value of legal records.

Originally it was planned that the present volume should contain cases concerning slavery in the so-called "free states" east of the Ohio River. In order, however, to equalize somewhat the size of the various volumes of the series, cases from Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Delaware were included along with cases from the Middle States and from New England. If one would imagine an acute triangle placed over the states included in this volume with the apex of the triangle resting upon Maine, the area of the triangle would represent roughly the proportions of the volume devoted to the various states beneath it and also the relative importance of slavery as an institution in the several states. Thus, while cases from Maryland occupy 152 pages, cases from Maine occupy only 5 pages, and cases from Vermont fill less than 2 pages.

For the study of slavery as an institution the cases from Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Delaware are much more important than those from the "free states" covered in this volume. Cases from the "free states" depict rather the death of an institution but shed some light upon the attitude, certainly of the courts and probably of the people, toward the slavery question. The Maryland cases present reasonably clear evidence of a transition from colonial times to the nineteenth century with respect to the legal problems arising out of slavery. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the cases dealing with crimes committed by slaves were numerous: the death penalty was often given for conviction of murder, rape, and theft. In the nineteenth century, however, comparatively few criminal cases arose. Cases regarding manumission, ownership, inheritance, sale of slaves, and in general, civil cases predominate. Perhaps this fact reflects nothing more than the general change in the penal code of the state but it would be interesting to know whether a study of the entire series when it is completed would contain enough similar material to make a substantial contribution to the problem of slavery as an educational system. Cases from the District of Columbia involve, for the most part, manumission of slaves, small details of the administration of Virginia and Maryland laws as they applied to the District, and petty misdemeanors on the part of Negroes. The Delaware cases present a prevailing

attitude toward slavery a little different from that of the other slave states. In Delaware a Negro was presumed to be free while in other states he was presumed to be a slave.

Obviously it is impossible in brief scope to summarize the cases regarding slavery in the nine "free states" included in this volume. It may be noted, however, that the greatest number of cases deal with wills, deeds, fugitive slave laws, the slave trade, the administration of the various state laws regarding slavery, and the application of the poor laws to indigent Negroes. Cases from Massachusetts shed considerable light upon Indian slavery and cases from Pennsylvania give the clearest picture of antislavery sentiment.

At the time of her death, November 10, 1933, Mrs. Catterall had not completed all the introductions or the collection of all of the material for this volume. Dr. James J. Hayden, Mr. George W. Dalzell, and Dr. J. Franklin Jameson assisted in the completion of the work. It is no discredit to Mrs. Catterall to say that her work was carried on with the same high standards that she had established.

Tufts College

RUHL J. BARTLETT

*Military Affairs in North America, 1748-1765; Selected Documents from the Cumberland Papers in Windsor Castle.* Edited by Stanley Pargellis. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936. Pp. xxxi, 514. Maps. \$8.00.)

This admirably edited collection of documents is a selection from the 400 American items among the Cumberland Papers in the Royal Archives of Windsor Castle. The Duke of Cumberland was captain general of the British army from 1745 to 1757 and an extensive correspondence reached him—letters from the American generals, reports, lists of troops and supplies, observations on the war—the written detail, in short, trivial or significant, that piles up on an executive's desk. Out of this heterogeneous mass, the editor has judiciously selected 136 items for full printing, and has included a brief calendar of about 50 others of less value. Six contemporary maps, a good index, adequate documentation, and an incisive introduction that should be carefully read, complete a book that in every aspect is up to the fine standard set by the Beveridge Memorial Fund Publications.

The papers are almost exclusively military in character, although there is incidental information of real value on social and economic conditions, particularly in the Northern colonies. The bulk of them relates to the years 1754 through 1757—from the incipience of Braddock's campaign to the resignation of the Duke of Cumberland—and thus do not cover the successful period of the war; there is in fact practically no information whatever on the campaigns in the interior after 1757.

The two most important groups of papers deal with Braddock's campaign and Loudoun's activities in 1756 and particularly in 1757. The documents relating

to Braddock's expedition include the official plan of the campaign, statements from local officials regarding the preparations for it, and several letters from General Braddock recounting his progress and his difficulties. "I have been greatly dissatisfied," he complained, "by the neglect and supineness of the Assemblies of those provinces, with which I am concern'd; they promis'd great Matters and have done nothing whereby instead of forwarding they have obstructed the Service." Three contemporary maps and several accounts of the defeat complete this unified series. The largest body of connected papers, 67 in all, cover Loudoun's administration of the army. These papers, many of them Lord Loudoun's own letters, substantiate and supplement the material in the editor's recent study of Loudoun in America. He too worked without full co-operation either at home or abroad, and his letters are full of the difficulties a commander faced; factional quarrels among the colonists, such as the Shirley feud, inadequate supplies, poor discipline among the troops ("*Dissertion and drunkenness*, are the diseases of this Country; I will stop at nothing to cure them both, if I should Stave every drop of Liquor in it"), and divided counsels plagued him daily. Worst of all, he himself, in common with all other American generals, failed to grasp the central problems involved in prosecuting the war in America, but just as he became fully cognizant of them, his patron resigned and he was removed.

Thus these documents reveal, fully in some particulars, sketchily in others, the reasons why success was so long denied the British. Implicit in them is the lack of co-operation between Pitt, who knew naval warfare, and Cumberland, who knew land warfare, with the resulting failure to integrate the two arms of the service. Explicit is the hopeless lack of co-operation and understanding between the colonists and British military officials. And finally, as Mr. Pargellis says, had the policy been continued of removing a commander as soon as he learned what to do, the French would have died of sheer starvation before they were defeated.

Agnes Scott College

PHILIP DAVIDSON

*The Territorial Papers of the United States.* Compiled and edited by Clarence Edwin Carter. Volume IV, *The Territory South of the River Ohio, 1790-1796.* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1936. Pp. ix, 517. \$1.75.)

The first reaction of the reviewer to this volume of documents relative to the territorial period of what is now the state of Tennessee is one of disappointment. He hastens to explain, however, that this statement is by no means intended as a reflection upon the abilities, the diligence, or the scholarship of the editor or a questioning of the value of the enterprise upon which he is engaged. *The Territorial Papers of the United States* promises to be a notable addition to the

list of documentary publications in the field of history of the United States, but the volume here reviewed will by no means be one of the most valuable of the series. The fault is not with the editor, but with circumstances over which he had no control: the paucity of administrative problems in the "Territory South of the River Ohio" which required or resulted in the making of written records for official files, the failure of the territorial governor, William Blount, to write often and at length regarding such problems as did arise, and the even more deplorable failure of officials of government to preserve many of the documents which once existed but have since been lost or destroyed, or, perchance, unknown to the editor, are now privately owned. After careful search for documents referred to in others which are here printed, the editor has been compelled to repeat in footnotes with disheartening frequency, "Not found." As a result, in order to produce a volume of sufficiently respectable size, Mr. Carter has found it necessary to depart in this instance from his previously announced intention of including in the series as a whole only a minimum of documents relating to Indian affairs. Furthermore, he has included in this volume many documents, not less than one third of the total, which have been printed elsewhere, in the *State Records of North Carolina*, the *American Historical Magazine*, the *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications*, the *American State Papers*, *Indian Affairs*, etc. It hardly needs to be said that most of these are reproduced by him with more scrupulous care for modern standards of editorial work than they formerly were and that their reproduction in this volume makes them more conveniently accessible.

It is of some significance to those who are concerned with the fate of the archives of the government of the United States that the originals of some ten per cent of the documents here printed appear to have been official records of officers of the territorial government and are now preserved (fortunately) by the Historical Society of Wisconsin, the Tennessee Historical Society, and Peabody College. More than one fourth are in the Washington Papers and the Jefferson Papers in the Library of Congress, official records of the executive branch of the government which were removed when the two presidents concerned retired from office, and were returned to the possession of the government as the result of purchase. Less than one fourth are in the state department and most of the others are in the files of the Senate, the House, and the war and post office departments.

The editorial work has been well done. Numerous footnotes contain useful annotations, cross references, and bibliographical citations. The index is detailed and accurate. The omission of an historical introduction is to be regretted.

*George McDuffie*. By Edwin L. Green. (Columbia, South Carolina: The State Company, 1936. Pp. 262. Bibliography. \$3.00.)

In a brief biography, commensurate, however, with his importance, Professor Green has sketched the life of a contemporary and associate of John C. Calhoun. The author's researches exhibit no conclusions that differ radically from those of J. G. de R. Hamilton's interpretation in the *Dictionary of American Biography*. The longer work, however, will serve a useful purpose, not only in illuminating the dynamic political setting in South Carolina during a crucial period in national history, but also as an index of the reactions of a Southern statesman of rather independent mold to events between 1820 and 1850. For, aside from peculiarities that were personal to McDuffie—his impassioned oratory, his hot temper, his wretched health—his career exhibits certain attachments of principle, perplexities of mind, and shifts in party allegiance that are worth noting. In them, too, lies the significance of McDuffie for the student of this period.

McDuffie was one of a long list of graduates of the College of South Carolina who carved a career in law and politics. He served in the general assembly, in the national House of Representatives, and for a brief term, in the Senate. He was also governor of South Carolina. Despite his reputation for eloquence he was no mere demagogue. He opposed the state rights doctrine long after fellow South Carolinians regarded broad construction as something akin to treason. He voted for internal improvements as late as 1832, on the ground that they were in the national interest. He supported the bank for the same reason, but eternally opposed the tariff because it favored a section and a capitalist class. In 1831 he cast his lot with the radicals arguing, however, that "a State cannot nullify an act of Congress by virtue of any power conferred by the Constitution," but that such a power "results from the mere fact of sovereignty."

Dr. Green's faithful treatment of his materials reveals that McDuffie's telling arguments in the tariff controversy were based upon the solid experience of a planter who was witness to impending agricultural deterioration without realizing that other factors than the protective tariff were at work. McDuffie, for example, opposed a liberal land policy because the farms of South Carolina were being deserted; and he defended slavery on the ground that the very ancestors of those who were attempting to interfere in the domestic affairs of the South had waxed rich upon the profits of the slave traffic. Many of his convictions, however, are pardonable for he himself employed a diversified crop system, advocated the use of fertilizer, and was intensely interested in promoting agricultural societies, and better transportation facilities in the South. He actually set up a textile mill on the Savannah, which unfortunately he lost interest in. He vigorously prosecuted the improvement of the common school system and the criminal code. His greatest triumph was the passage of the tariff legislation of 1846 which he firmly believed would solve the economic equation of the South. Failing health and death spared him the agonies of disillusionment.

*Presidential Politics in the United States, 1841-1844.* By Oscar Doane Lambert. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1936. Pp. ix, 220. Appendix, bibliography. \$3.00.)

This book has the merits of a clear style and of objectivity, with a tendency to oversimplify some of the intricacies of a rather unique administration, the head of which was derisively and quite accurately entitled "His Accidenty" by leaders of the party which had nominated him for the vice-presidency. After an unfortunate start in the first two chapters, Dr. Lambert finds his way to an interesting and illuminating exposition of the disruption of President Tyler's cabinet and the construction of a new one, the men and measures that shaped the political strategy previous to the conventions of 1844, the proceedings of the conventions and the conferences that went on simultaneously, the conduct of the campaign, and the reasons for Polk's election which is attributed to the electorate's fear of Clay and not to its love for Polk. He found no evidence that the election was waged and won on the Texas question.

Dr. Lambert's unfamiliarity with the files of the newspapers in 1840 and with the background of the election of that year caused him to choose the wrong springboard for his plunge into the agitated political waters of the forties. He accepts at face value the comments of the Whig papers at the time of Tyler's succession to the presidency and says that the victory of the Whigs in the election shows that the people expected Whig principles to be enacted into law. One might infer from his pages that Tyler's defection from the Clay wing of the Whig party can be attributed to a scheme of the Democrats to draw him into their grasp. The fact is that in 1840 the Whig party was not a party. It was a coalition of political ragtag and bobtail which adopted no platform and conducted a hip hurrah campaign which for dishonesty and evasion can compete for honors with any campaign that might be named. In some states the ticket even masqueraded under the name "Jacksonian Whig party." Harrison's campaign speeches and inaugural address, in which he discoursed on Roman history, prove that he was not master of his own voice or pen. Tyler was nominated for the vice-presidency in order to add to the political crazy quilt the tidewater aristocracy of the South Atlantic section. The Whigs were united only in condemning.

In the judgment of the reviewer, it is Clay, not Tyler, who elicits the greatest sympathy because of his dismal failure to play the rôle of Major Domus. The proper approach to the Tyler administration is to accept the premise that the victory of the Whigs proved to be their undoing. In joining the Whig coalition, Tyler, Henry A. Wise, and William C. Rives, all of Virginia, former Democrats and state rights men, had no intention of laying aside their well-known principles. Even before Harrison's inauguration their "insurgency" had attracted widespread attention. If the Whigs and the electorate expected "Whig principles" to be enacted into law, why was Clay passed over in favor of a colorless candidate?



Dr. Lambert erroneously concludes that Clay's resolutions which were offered in the special session of Congress were not inspired by hostility to or distrust of Tyler. In stating that Clay's distribution bill survived all opposition, he overlooks two important amendments: first, the coupling with it of a pre-emption bill; and second, the twenty per cent proviso, without which it would not have passed the Senate over the opposition of Southern Whigs who, like Tyler, were jealous guardians of the validity of the Compromise Tariff of 1833. The twenty per cent proviso having been adopted, in the next session of Congress Tyler drove Clay into a position where he had to choose between a higher tariff and his own pet distribution scheme. In fact, Tyler won every round in his fight with Clay. These considerations would have materially altered Dr. Lambert's approach and conclusions.

University of Minnesota

GEORGE M. STEPHENSON

*Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist. Volume II (1846-1851).* Edited by Herbert Anthony Kellar. (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1936. Pp. xvii, 556. Illustrations, bibliography. \$2.00.)

The second volume of *Solon Robinson (Indiana Historical Collections, XXII)*, which includes documents for the six-year period 1846-1851, brings to a close Mr. Herbert A. Kellar's task of presenting a pioneer and agriculturist to the historical guild through the medium of original material. In the mechanics of editing—selection, arrangement, footnoting, and verification—Mr. Kellar's work will serve as a model for similar projects; his untiring industry, meticulous attention to detail, and genuine enthusiasm for his work are qualities which may well be emulated by those who embark on so ambitious an enterprise. Incidentally, the editor has demonstrated the value of such projects; there are at least a dozen other agriculturists who deserve similar treatment.

Students interested in Southern agriculture will find the second volume replete with information on many subjects. Robinson's journeys into the South in the late forties and early fifties yielded some thirty articles in the *American Agriculturist* and innumerable contributions to other agricultural journals and newspapers. While he visited most of the Southern states, his writings on tour dealt mainly with Mississippi, Louisiana, and the Carolinas. Consciously or otherwise, he added to the historical value of his observations by including the route of his travels and by indicating the names of planters and plantations visited. He came into the South without prejudiced notions of its economic and social life, though one may suspect that, as agent for the *American Agriculturist* and A. B. Allen and Company's warehouse, he consciously attempted to ingratiate himself with the people of the section. Be that as it may, he had an uncanny sense for acquiring accurate information and for making penetrating observations.

Perhaps no other Northern traveler comprehended so clearly as Robinson the Southern state of mind. He drew few odious comparisons; his criticism was

unusually constructive. The essay on "Negro Slavery at the South," reprinted from *De Bow's Review*, embraces more than fifty pages in Mr. Kellar's work, and reveals a Northerner's ability to understand the peculiar Southern institution. He prefaced his essay with the statement that his object was "neither to advocate slavery or its abolition; but rather to give a plain narration of facts, from which every man may draw his own conclusions" (pp. 253-54). Although much of the material and method was not original with Robinson, no Southerner—Harper, Hammond, or Dew—ever presented a better defense of Negro slavery or a more caustic denunciation of abolition fanatics. At a later time, circumstances led Robinson to assume antislavery ground, but in the forties and early fifties his desire for improved agriculture revealed the necessity of allaying sectional discord.

A general introduction to Robinson's career appeared in the first volume; the second includes an extensive bibliography. The section devoted to periodicals and serials will serve as a convenient handbook of many agricultural magazines. The two volumes are indexed separately.

Louisiana State University

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON

*Audubon*. By Constance Rourke. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1936. Pp. 342. Illustrated. \$3.00.)

*Audubon*, by Miss Constance Rourke, is a pleasing and informal biographical narrative. The author has brilliantly conceived the spirit of her subject, and consequently the volume is replete with charming incident and vivid description.

The reader is introduced to a French lad of mysterious birth (1785), who though called by the surname "Audubon," was variously known by the given names "Fourgere," "La Foret," "Jean Rabin," and "Jean Jacques La Foret." At an early age this strange son of a practical and unimaginative father evidenced an amazing aptitude for naturalistic art and observation. He assiduously applied himself toward the perfection of his talents. In early maturity young Audubon was sent by his father to America. He at this period of his life was described by a lady of discernment as being "the swiftest skater I ever beheld . . . his dancing exceeded his skating . . . a handsomer man I never saw." After failing to adjust himself on his father's estate, "Mill Grove," near Philadelphia, the gifted young man returned to France. A year later he came back to America, sold his interest in "Mill Grove," and accepted a clerical position in a New York countinghouse. Convinced that greater opportunity was to be found in the West, Audubon went to Louisville and opened a store. This venture was ruined by the effects of the Embargo Act. He then went back to Philadelphia and married Lucy Bakewell, to whom he had been engaged for several years. With his wife, he returned to the West and began a new mercantile enterprise at Henderson, Kentucky, which was speedily dissolved by disaster. Following this misfortune,

Audubon devoted himself with singleness of purpose to the scientific and artistic study of ornithology. He was restless, tireless, and enthusiastic in his wanderings through the Western wilderness and in his search for new subjects. He occasionally halted his traveling to earn money by painting portraits or by giving instruction. Some time was thus spent in Natchez, New Orleans, and St. Francisville, Louisiana. In the last place he tarried for a considerable period. There he was joined by his wife who found employment as a governess. Leaving St. Francisville, Audubon went to Philadelphia in search of a publisher and of subscribers for his proposed work, *Birds of America*. Failing in this endeavor he went abroad and was accorded a sympathetic reception in Liverpool and in Edinburgh. After various vicissitudes a publisher and subscribers were found, and publication began in 1827. Four years later, there appeared the first volume of his *Ornithological Biography*. Coming back to America, the naturalist continued his travels and work. In collaboration with John Bachman, the *Viviparous Quadrupeds of America* was projected. The plates for these volumes were completed by his sons, for Audubon had finished only about half of them before his death (1851).

The foregoing sketch is briefly indicative of the naturalist's long quest for beauty. He was thoroughly familiar with the valleys of the Ohio and the Mississippi. He traveled later in life along the Atlantic coast from Florida to Labrador. Audubon adapted himself to the crudities of the frontier with easy *savoir faire*. The flexible personality of the cultivated French gentleman permitted him to surrender without a struggle to the idiosyncrasies of his rough companions. The long and careless growth of his hair might have been in New York or Edinburgh vaguely suggestive of the poetic, but on the fringes of Western civilization, such was the universal resignation to a necessary incumbrance.

Though gracefully convivial in the company of cultivated people, the painter found spiritual ecstasy in the vast solitude of the primeval forests. As for the absolute necessity of human association to complete his happiness, he once remarked with a touch of humorous cynicism that no companionship could be more gratifying than that of the society of woodpeckers.

Miss Rourke gives in her volume a sustained impression of Audubon's struggle to overcome every obstacle which threatened his purpose, for he was undaunted by the dangers of the wilderness or the flatteries of civilization. He tramps the woods with gun in hand and his aesthetic soul is forever sensitive to the wondrous loveliness of nature. He paints, often despairs and destroys, and begins anew with fervid persistence. He is inspired in his noble ambition by the inspiration of the gentle Lucy and the children. He ultimately triumphs with the publication of his first great work, *Birds of America*. If he were a scientist, he was one of the opposing clan. Undeniably, he was one of the greatest artists in the difficult medium of water colors or pastels. The sheer beauty of his paintings endures. Upon them there is a light "which is clear and cool, as though the

world was seen in the early mornings. These paintings have a fresh impersonal air that belongs to an era of discovery."

To the reviewer it seems that Miss Rourke has contributed but little that is new to the knowledge of Audubon's life. Naturally, she has been inclined to favor the positive elements of his character, and has softened or ignored his faults and failings. The story is told in quiet and delightful style. The reader who wishes relaxation as well as information will have but little criticism to advance as regards the descriptive passages, and *maybe*, the inclination toward fancy, for these are consistent with the spirit and character of the great ornithologist.

The book is bound in attractive blue cloth. The format in general is excellent. Twelve beautiful plates from original Audubon studies and numerous woodcuts enhance the beauty of the book. Sources are listed in a final section designated as a "Note."

Louisiana State University

LESLIE M. NORTON

*In Old Natchez.* By Catharine Van Court. (New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., 1937. Pp. xvi, 119. Illustrations. \$3.00.)

This little work of 119 pages is frankly designed for the enlightenment of tourists and makes no pretense of pleasing historians. It begins with a brief account of the better known legends which have contributed to the creation of Natchez local color, and proceeds to a series of sketches on the more famous edifices, with 33 accompanying photographs. These photographs are the only part of the work which has any value for historical writers, in that they help somewhat in visualizing the society of the celebrated city, whereas the text which goes with them is discursive and unsupported by references—in short, useless for research. A scholarly work on Natchez, with authenticated dates and facts and an army of footnotes in deference to the hocus-pocus of learning, is long overdue.

Tulane University

M. SWEARINGEN

*The Romantic Story of Texas.* By Peter Molyneaux. (New York and Dallas: The Cordova Press, Inc., 1936. Pp. xii, 463. \$2.50.)

Despite the implication of the title and the extravagant statement of the publisher's blurb on the jacket, this book cannot be accepted as the complete story of the development of Texas. The three hundred years of Spanish activities in Texas are disposed of in eight pages and nothing is said about Texas as a part of the United States. This means that Mr. Molyneaux confines his "story of Texas" to the twenty-five years from the beginning of Anglo-American colonization in Texas to the accomplishment of annexation. He explains that the book "is an attempt to present in the form of a connected narrative, between the

two covers of a single volume, what has been revealed by the most competent historical research with respect to this subject." This general statement, together with a blanket acknowledgment of his indebtedness to Dr. Eugene C. Barker, Dr. Herbert E. Bolton (who, he says, is at Stanford University!), and the late George Lockhart Rives, constitutes the nearest approach to a citation of the materials on which the work is based. It does not justify, however, the journalistic paraphrasing and at times the outright appropriation of the language of those writers.

Perhaps the best evidence of his dependence on secondary works is to be found in the distribution of space devoted to various aspects of the subject. To the period up to 1835, which has been covered in a thoroughly satisfactory manner in Barker's *Life of Stephen F. Austin*, Mr. Molyneaux devotes 31 chapters, with a total of 286 pages; to the period of the Revolution, on which comparatively little of a secondary nature has been written, he gives 4 chapters and 64 pages; for the period of the Republic, which is undoubtedly as important as either of the other two, but on which almost nothing has been written, he has 1 chapter of 15 pages; and on the question of annexation, 3 chapters with a total of 91 pages. The book shows no evidence of direct contact with the sources through which he might have enlarged upon the aspects neglected by other secondary writers. To be sure, there are numerous quotations from both private and official correspondence of the time, but these are apparently drawn from quotations used by others.

One is inclined to feel that the author has deliberately resurrected a discarded interpretation of the Texas story and has then selected his material to destroy this imaginary ghost. Anyone who has taken the trouble to read the scholarly works of Barker, Garrison, Rives, and Justin H. Smith—to mention only the more important—knows that the myth of the slavery influence has long since been proved untenable, and that it is now generally understood that annexation was the result of the natural process of frontier development rather than of a nefarious plot to despoil Mexico. Those who have not read such books can hardly be expected to take this one seriously, because of the complete absence of footnotes, bibliography, and index—necessary symbols of a scholarly treatment.

The work is marred by careless proofreading as well as by an occasional ungrammatical sentence. Its effect is also weakened by the author's tendency to present sweeping generalizations which would be difficult to substantiate. For example, few historians would be willing to accept the categorical assertion that "the precise moment of the beginning of the history of modern Texas" can be fixed at two days before Christmas in the year 1820 with the meeting of Moses Austin and the Baron de Bastrop on the plaza at San Antonio. Certainly none would agree that this incident was sufficiently important to be dragged in as the conclusion of each of the first five chapters of the book. One suspects that the object is to obtain dramatic effect rather than to present an accurate picture. The

book was obviously written for the uncritical reader who seeks entertainment rather than for the discerning student who is looking for new information, and it is perhaps unfair to attempt to pass judgment upon it as history.

Vanderbilt University

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY

*The First Polish Colonies of America in Texas; Containing Also the General History of the Polish People in Texas.* Compiled by Rev. Edward J. Dworaczyk. (San Antonio: The Naylor Company, 1936. Pp. xix, 201. Illustrations. \$2.50.)

Included among the European people who came to Texas during the nineteenth century were the Germans, French, Dutch, Swedes, Czechs, and Poles. The story before the reviewer is an account of the Polish settlements in Texas, or, more particularly, of parishes of the Catholic Church in Texas in which the Poles form either all or at least the large majority of the communicants.

The account takes into consideration two periods of Polish immigration in Texas. The first period began about a quarter of a century after the Polish revolution of 1830 against Nicholas I; the second began very shortly after the Polish revolution of 1863 against Czar Alexander II.

Of the twenty-four parishes treated in the book, only a handful were originally founded by Polish settlers. These are Panna Maria, the mother settlement founded on December 24, 1854, in Karnes County through the efforts of Father Leopold Moczygemba; St. Hedwig, founded in Bexar County in 1854; Cestochowa (known also as St. Joe), founded in Karnes County in 1873; Kosciusko, founded in Wilson County in 1892; and Polonia, founded near Lockhart in 1898. The remaining Polish communities are located in and around settlements founded in earlier times by other racial stocks whom the Poles have outnumbered. To name them all is unnecessary, but among them are Bandera, originally a Mormon settlement, it is said, in Bandera County; Yorktown, in De Witt County, originally a German settlement; and Bellville, in Austin County, an Anglo-American settlement. The parishes in the San Antonio diocese sprang, in the main, from the mother settlement at Panna Maria, while those of the Galveston diocese look to New Waverly in Walker County as their cradle. Farthest away from these two centers is the Polish community of White Deer, Carson County, in the Upper Panhandle.

Besides the parishes, the author speaks also of the Congregation of the Holy Family of Nazareth, a congregation of Polish nuns conducting Loretto Hospital in Dalhart, the Nazareth Hospital at Mineral Wells, and the Bethania Hospital in Wichita Falls. The Felician Sisters, another congregation of Polish nuns, conduct parochial schools at Bremond, Cestochowa, St. Hedwig, Poth, and Yorktown.

In all of the Polish parishes in Texas, religion and religious education have played an important part in the life of the people. These two closely related

forces have caused the Polish people to stick together and to perpetuate the civilization which they brought with them to Texas. Many sacrifices had to be made to build churches, schools, and rectories, but the spirit of the people and the encouragement of their priests made this work possible.

University of Texas

R. L. BIESELE

*Bois d'Arc to Barb'd Wire, Ken Cary: Southwestern Frontier Born.* By James K. Greer. (Dallas: Dealey and Lowe, 1936. Pp. 428. Illustrations. \$2.50.)

Pioneer days in West Texas are vividly yet simply described in *Bois d'Arc to Barb'd Wire*, a tale by James K. Greer which centers around Ken Cary, an imaginary figure who lived vigorously among the cross timbers and on the plains from 1850 until the eighteen nineties. Cary is merely a peg on which the author hangs an authoritative study of incidents which befell the average rancher in the days when the border settlements followed the eastern edge of the plains. The major portion of the experiences, pictured as having occurred to the hero, are based on actual happenings as numerous bibliographical notes at the close of the book indicate. In fact, there is no attempt made to create a unified plot, nor does the author confine himself to writing an imaginary biography; instead, his purpose is to show the development of the West Texas frontier as seen through the eyes of a boy who matured and lived his life along this borderland of civilization. This end is well achieved.

The setting of the narrative is in Bosque County where Cary moved with his parents in 1856. In his frontier schooling, he learned to handle a lariat and the art of breaking the mustang pony. Cary killed his first antelope in his eleventh year. He hunted the deer as well, and a few years later in the short grass country farther west, he brought the buffalo to bay.

Indians scourged his neighborhood until the middle seventies, and although Cary and his family escaped serious mishap at their hands, some of his friends were not so fortunate. The tales of depredations of these plains Indians are graphically told, as are the scouting expeditions led by the frontiersmen against them.

With the Chisholm trail, Ken Cary was familiar. In his early youth, he accompanied a cattle drive to Kansas. On this expedition, he learned to face with calmness the hazards of crossing a herd over the North Canadian and other streams, the dangers of passing through the Indian Territory, and the terror of sudden death from the constantly impending stampede. At the end of the trail lay Abilene, a boom town established in 1867 by Joseph G. McCoy on the Kansas Pacific Railway. Full of poorly built huts, saloons, dance halls, and gambling resorts, it proved to be an opportune spot for shooting scrapes, one of which Cary witnessed.

After his return from Kansas, Cary obtained employment on a ranch south of San Antonio. Here he met the daughter of his employer, Mozella Lloyd, a girl

whom he later married following a lengthy courtship and the acquisition of a ranch in Bosque County.

During the period 1873-1884, Cary watched with interest the barbed wire wars which flamed up in the cross timbered and short grass sections of West Texas. Barbed wire had come to take the place of the bois d'arc hedge in those sections of Texas where that tree could grow, while on the plains, the wire was for the first time inclosing the hitherto open range. Objections, in the form of wire cutting, came from cattlemen who owned no property. As a result, incensed owners resorted to arms to protect their rights and clashes ensued. Cary himself patrolled his fenced property. These troubles ended soon after the legislature made wire cutting illegal and demanded the establishment of gates on public roads which passed through inclosed land.

The author concludes the book with the year 1890, when Cary realized that the end of an era had come: the Texas frontier had passed away forever. Simple and direct in its narrative style, the author manages to recapture convincingly the color and strength of a past day. This book is worth reading.

John Tarleton Agricultural College

CURTIS NUNN

*William G. Brownlow, Fighting Parson of the Southern Highlands.* By E. Merton Coulter. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1937. Pp. xii, 432. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.50.)

To have found a writer better qualified than Professor Coulter to prepare a biography of "Parson" Brownlow would have been exceedingly difficult; to have entrusted the task to anyone with a less facile pen and a less discerning eye than his would have been unfortunate indeed. So colorful was the career and so enigmatic the personality of Tennessee's Reconstruction governor that his life presents an unusual opportunity to a biographer. Professor Coulter has made the most of his opportunities. He has given us a portrait clear and distinct in its outlines, vivid and picturesque in its coloring, produced with a sympathetic understanding of the subject, yet without the slightest tendency toward eulogy.

Although comparatively unknown today, William G. Brownlow was in his day "as well known in politics as his contemporary Abraham Lincoln, in journalism as his rival George D. Prentice, and in religion as Bishop Asbury." His accomplishments, however, were of "such a nature that succeeding generations have sought to forget them, even as a nightmare." As a Methodist circuit rider he "developed a small area of disturbance in religion in the Southern Highlands"; and even after he had shifted his talents to the field of journalism he continued to unloose "in the name of Christianity a terrible flood of epithets and personal abuse" against the Presbyterians and Baptists which was without parallel. During an era when personal journalism was in vogue he attained a reputation for picturesque and abusive language and stinging invective which was un-



equaled by the most slanderous of his contemporaries. Probably as a result of the notoriety achieved by his vitriolic pen he was able to build up for his Knoxville *Whig*, published earlier at Elizabethton and Jonesboro, a circulation national as well as local which was approached by few other papers in the ante-bellum South. There is little doubt but that he was among the most influential of Southern editors. His paper was a powerful force in developing and maintaining the influence of the Whig party in the South, in postponing the withdrawal of Tennessee from the Union until it was the last state to join the Confederacy, and in maintaining the ascendancy of Union sentiment in East Tennessee throughout the war.

After being jailed and then banished because of the incendiary nature of his editorials and because of his influence in keeping alive Unionist opposition to the Confederate government in East Tennessee, he "toured the North as a martyr to the cause of Unionism in the South and talked himself into a small fortune." He was lionized to such an extent that at times he "almost crowded Lincoln off the stage"; and *Parson Brownlow's Book* and numerous other products of his pen became "best sellers" throughout the North. Returning to Knoxville "on the heels" of Burnside's army, he re-established his paper under the significant title, *Brownlow's Knoxville Whig and Rebel Ventilator*, and took a leading part in the development of the plans of the East Tennessee Unionists for obtaining control of the state whenever civil government should be restored. When this program achieved success Brownlow was elected to the governorship. Concerning the selection of Brownlow for this office, the author comments, "For the promoting of the orderly progress of peace, it would have been impossible to make a worse choice; for carrying out a war of vengeance of a minority against a majority, Brownlow was incomparably the best selection that could have been made" (p. 262).

As governor, Brownlow instituted a regime of "violence and vengeance which stunned the South and produced misgivings in the minds of even such Northerners as Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner." His "program from the beginning [was] to use his power as dictator of Tennessee to punish those against whom he had a grudge, public or private. . . . He found Tennessee financially bankrupt and he proceeded to whip her down into far deeper distress; he found her an economic desolation and he left her as he had found her; he found social chaos among Unionists and Rebels and he added to the turmoil by setting the Negro upon the back of his former master" (pp. 262-63).

This analysis of the Brownlow regime, although far from charitable, when viewed from the standpoint of purposes and results is not far from the truth. It fails to take into account sufficiently, however, the fact that along with his motive of vengeance Brownlow had as a major purpose the complete alignment of his program with that of the Radicals in Congress in order to facilitate the early return of Tennessee to its normal position in the Union. In this design he

was successful, and Tennessee thus escaped the harsh program of military reconstruction applied to the other ten states of the Confederacy. Brownlow's government was tyrannical, but it was a tyranny of whites, mostly Tennesseans, rather than of Negroes and Carpetbaggers. The author has tempered his indictment, however, by pointing out that Brownlow "was not as bad as his words; . . . He did not actually thirst for the blood of his enemies. Though he was quick to protect himself in single combat, he had no intentions of slaughtering his Tennessee foes as he wildly threatened at times. He liked to frighten those with whom he disagreed. He had a gentle private nature" (p. vi). Brownlow's "intimates knew that he was a Dr. Jekyll and a Mr. Hyde. Publicly he could be a raging, irresponsible terrorist; privately he could be as gentle as the Good Samaritan" (p. 396). Nevertheless, the "Parson" cannot be absolved from responsibility for the disregard for law and order encouraged by his vengeful and vindictive public attitude, or for the opportunities for fraud and maladministration in public affairs presented by his "inability to see guile in a Radical, however disreputable he might be."

Professor Coulter has given us more than a biography of Brownlow. He has woven skillfully around the career of the "Parson" the threads of the religious, economic, and political history of his time. He has used a great variety of sources with care and discrimination, but was handicapped somewhat by his inability to uncover any extensive collection of Brownlow manuscripts. In an effort to overcome this deficiency he examined the private papers of several of Brownlow's contemporaries, but, convinced that the "Parson" "exposed himself as completely in his books, pamphlets, and newspapers as in his private correspondence," he did not extend this search as widely as was possible. Omitted from his bibliography, for example, is any reference to several collections of private papers located in Knoxville, particularly those of T. A. R. Nelson and O. P. Temple, in which may be found a few Brownlow letters which could have been used to advantage. One of these, written to Temple, indicates that Brownlow conceived in his overactive imagination the idea that President Johnson was planning a "second rebellion, more bloody than the first," as early as March 8, 1866, several months before he considered it safe to come out openly in opposition to the President.

Although liable to excite acrimonious discussion, Professor Coulter's significant contribution in re-creating in a brilliant yet unbiased manner Tennessee's most inimicable historical character will remain of enduring value and interest to the casual reader as well as to the student of history.

University of Tennessee

STANLEY J. FOLMSBEE

*The Road to Reunion, 1865-1900.* By Paul H. Buck. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1937. Pp. xi, 320. \$3.25.)

As an exposition of the gradual disappearance of war hatreds, and of Southern reparticipation in the life of the nation, this work will rank among the best single volumes of recent years in American history. It combines an especially significant theme with excellent craftsmanship.

The narrative begins with the victorious North which inflicted a harsh peace and adopted a highly prejudiced view of the South, and then turns to the South which built up a propaganda of hatred and maintained its fundamental beliefs, while accepting the results of the war and undertaking an unremitting struggle for the necessities of life. Deep-seated distrust, which was expressed in memoirs, histories, and textbooks, was created by the agitation over the Confederacy's treatment of prisoners, Northern devastation of the South, the punishment of Jefferson Davis, and the Negro question. Both great parties were sectionally conscious, the one remembering the war issues, the other advocating a quick settlement, and each seeking its own advantage.

Unwisely resisting reconstruction at first, the Democrats soon sought reconciliation on the basis of acceptance. An important step towards adjustment was taken by the Liberal Republicans, and the compromise of 1877 committed the Republicans to a less irreconcilable stand. A national trend set in towards conciliation, and Southern leaders consciously sought to gain Northern confidence. A revival of the "bloody shirt" and the disfranchisement of the Negro served to check this developing understanding. Further progress grew out of the celebration of Memorial Day, amnesty, Lamar's speech on Sumner, better literature on the South, centennials of Revolutionary events, Northern aid in the yellow fever epidemic of 1878, and national grief over the death of Garfield. As plantations were divided into small farms, as free labor replaced slavery, as retail trade arose, and as railroads joined the South to the North, so economic bonds of union were forged, although the flow of Northern capital and labor did not meet expectations. Reconciliation was hindered by repudiation of state bonds, but was furthered by the Western cattle business, the tourist trade, the migration of Southern youth to Northern cities, and efforts to advance education.

The despair of older Southern leaders was replaced by the hope of younger men, among whom were Woodrow Wilson, Walter H. Page, and D. A. Tompkins. Some were highly critical of the past, others were respectful enough, but all looked ahead. Industrial development which disrupted the South's agricultural unity, and political self-rule restored confidence. The press sought to harmonize Southern regionalism with nationalism, as the optimism of the New South was welcomed in the North. Finding their market in the North, Southern writers adjusted their outlook to Northern views. They wrote that the South was better off in the Union, while they praised the devotion and courage of Southerners. They pictured the slave as happy and contented, the South as

basically American, and the suffering of reconstruction as due to Southern Scalawags. This "current of sentiment swelled into a flood that engulfed the nation's readers." Northern writers took up the theme and the leading magazines pursued a policy of reconciliation. In a day when Civil War dramas ending in intersectional marriages were very popular, belligerency could not survive. Although the G. A. R. and the U. C. V. tended to perpetuate war issues, they were drawn together in joint celebrations, where recrimination and resentment were laid aside, and the war leaders of both sides were idealized. Cleveland's administration relieved Northern fear of Southern democracy, and gave greater security to the South, although flags and pensions caused a temporary turmoil. Harrison was elected without the "bloody shirt," and the defeat of the "force bill" was the last threat to the South's control of its domestic affairs. Accordingly the Negro was reduced to near serfdom, legally disfranchised, and rigidly segregated, but given a lowly place in which he was accepted and helped. It was a basis of understanding, but a heavy burden politically and socially. The problem was recognized as unsoluble and therefore one that must be endured. Gradually a new national patriotism grew out of sectional co-operation in social causes and in industry, a nationalism which respected regional culture. Dixie thought of herself as a unit in a larger unit and her sincerity was demonstrated in the Spanish-American War. Reconciliation, a noble achievement, was a reality.

The significance of the work lies in the field of social history rather than political history. The chapters on politics are good summaries, but are summaries of well-known facts, and the amount of new interpretation is not large. Likewise the descriptions of economic developments are not the best part of the book. But in the chapters treating the literary activities and the thinking of North and South, the author is brilliant. It is all nicely proportioned, synthesized, and presented in splendid style. Not a dull spot, and scarcely a weak sentence, is to be found.

Weaknesses seem to be inevitable, but in the main are of minor importance. The records and books that are being gathered into Southern libraries today from the homes of ante-bellum planters, indicate that the planter did possess many books that were then modern and newspapers that had wide influence (p. 28). An exaggeration, which is disproved by such recent literature as *I'll Take My Stand*, is found on page 178, "The eighties, however, witnessed a growth so remarkable that all the ancient prejudices and lingering doubts were swept aside." "The decentralization of Southern agriculture" may have brought the "section nearer to the Northern way of life" (p. 147), and the ills of the agricultural South may have become "the ills of the nation at large" (p. 302), but so many exceptions appear that the statements are open to question. It is also doubtful whether sufficient attention was given to the Klan. The failure to treat the older sectionalism, and the geographical basis of sectionalism and regionalism, gives the impression that the author avoided certain forces that did not

further his theme. The failure to define the boundaries of the South and the inclusion of Maryland and West Virginia as well as the Southern Great Plains may not please the regionalists, but the general conclusion of the work must please that school of thought.

More serious criticism may be found in the omission of a bibliography. The depression is over, and publishers should not require, if this is the explanation, this stunting of an excellent book. The preface mentions some sixteen hundred bibliographical items, which can scarcely have been included in the footnotes. Although "it had been demonstrated . . . that a son of the South could, under the new conditions of life, be at the same time a loyal Southerner and a loyal American," it is not perfectly clear that the war prejudices had entirely disappeared. With the churches still divided into Northern and Southern wings, the South still solid, and the Negro problem largely unsolved and in the main a Southern problem, it may be that the theme has not been exhausted. Perhaps a second volume which would bring the story to a more recent period and include a bibliography for the entire work, would be a worthy undertaking, now that the present volume has been so well done.

Louisiana State University

JOHN D. BARNHART

*Claude Kitchin and the Wilson War Policies.* By Alex Mathews Arnett. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1937. Pp. xii, 341. Bibliography, illustrations. \$3.00.)

In the revision of the history of American entrance into the World War, little research has been directed toward the work of those legislators who opposed the warmaking policies. Professor Arnett begins this re-examination by tracing the congressional career of Claude Kitchin of North Carolina, floor leader of the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives during that crucial period. No attempt is made at a well-rounded biography, and except for a summary of Kitchin's earlier life in the first chapter, the book is confined to a detailed study of his relation to the contests bearing upon the various war policies. In addition to the usual sources, Arnett has used Kitchin's correspondence and scrapbooks, as well as interviews and correspondence with still living colleagues.

Most controversial is the evidence presented which indicates that Wilson was ready to bring the United States to the aid of the Entente in April, 1916, and was prevented from doing it by the vigorous opposition of Kitchin, Champ Clark, and Henry Flood, who threatened to defeat such a move in the House of Representatives. The evidence for the now famous "Sunrise Conference" is not conclusive, but it is sufficient to establish a reasonable probability, and Arnett presents it in that manner.

Of equal importance is Arnett's presentation of the close connection between the preparedness movement and the other efforts to bring the United States into

the war. This is new ground, and the author has plowed it as completely as the available sources permit.

Second only to these two themes is the careful treatment of the congressional struggle over wartime taxation. Kitchin and a few other Southern and Western legislators led the drive to make the profiteer pay his share of the costs of the war. Their degree of success, while substantial, is not an adequate measure of the courage and tactical skill displayed in the fight. One of the more interesting threads running through the book is the demonstration that almost without exception the metropolitan press set out to destroy the political power of a leader with whom they disagreed. In carrying out this persecution, even the better journals resorted to the most reprehensible varieties of innuendo and deliberate falsification. The picture they persistently cultivated of Kitchin as "a small bigot from an ill-favored district in North Carolina" was done so effectively that in so far as he is remembered at all by the newspaper reading public today, it is in these terms. That Kitchin was able to stay in public life in spite of it, is a credit to the constituency that regularly returned him to Congress.

No study of so many highly controversial issues could agree completely with the judgments of all other students. Many will prefer a somewhat different selection of adjectives in several instances. Some will give Wilson credit for a more realistically neutral attitude, especially in December of 1916 and January of 1917, at least until the evidence from Wilson's private papers for this period is presented. It is not necessary either to accept C. A. Beard's judgment that Bryan secretly reversed his order against credits to belligerents; for the evidence Beard presented in the *New Republic* was hardly conclusive.

Few errors were noted in the book. Clarence Cannon was and is a Democrat, not a Republican. "Seymour, Waldman" in the bibliography should be "Waldman, Seymour." The first number in the footnote on page 98 obviously should be 2 rather than 22. The book is illustrated with a fine selection of cartoons from contemporary newspapers.

Professor Arnett has made an exceedingly valuable addition to the growing literature on this subject. His approach is new, his sources hitherto unused, and his contribution belongs on the most select reading list relating to the United States and the World War.

University of Missouri

ELMER ELLIS

## Historical News and Notes

The program committee for the third annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association, which is to be held in Durham and Chapel Hill, North Carolina, November 18-20, announces that arrangements are practically complete. The meeting will open with a session on Thursday afternoon devoted to "The Significance of Urban Life in the Old South." Thomas J. Wertenbaker, Princeton University, will serve as chairman and the following papers will be presented: "The Virginia City in 1860," by James F. Barnes, II, Washington and Lee University; "New Orleans—Metropolitan Oasis," by Mack Swearingen, Tulane University; "Urban Influences in Producing Southern Literature," by Edd Winfield Parkes, University of Georgia. The discussion leader will be Carl Brindenbaugh, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. On Thursday evening Duke University will sponsor a dinner at which William K. Boyd, Duke University, will preside and George Arants, New York City, will deliver an address upon the subject, "Material on the History of Tobacco." After the dinner the Association will hold a joint meeting with the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina. William T. Laprade, president of the North Carolina society, will preside and three papers (the speakers have not yet been selected) will present "Chapters in the History of Tobacco."

There will be two Friday morning sessions. One will consider "The Aftermath of Populism with Special Reference to the Regulation of Public Utilities." The chairman will be W. B. Hesseltine of the University of Wisconsin. F. B. Simkins of State Teachers College, Farmville, Virginia, will discuss "Regulation of Public Utilities in South Carolina"; Thomas D. Clark of the University of Kentucky will present a paper on "Railroad Legislation in Kentucky in the Early Nineteen Hundreds." The third participant has not yet been selected. The discussion leader will be A. B. Moore of the University of Alabama. At the other morning session Walter Prichard of Louisiana State University will preside and three "Aspects of Southwestern History" will be treated: "The Army of Texas, 1836," by William C. Binkley of Vanderbilt University; "Zachary Taylor as President of the United States," by William O. Lynch of Indiana University; and "The New Orleans General Strike of 1892," by Roger W. Shugg of Princeton University. A luncheon conference on "Archives and Manuscripts in the South" has been scheduled for Friday noon. Lester J. Cappon, University of Virginia, will preside and Frank Graham, president of the University of North

Carolina, will make the address of welcome. Three discussions will be given: "Research Materials of the Williamsburg Restoration," by Mrs. Helen Bullock of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.; "The WPA Survey of the Federal Archives," by Philip M. Hamer of The National Archives; and "The Southern Collection of the University of North Carolina," by J. G. de R. Hamilton of the University of North Carolina.

On Friday afternoon Kathryn Abbey, Florida State College for Women, will serve as chairman at a session which will consider "The Slavery Controversy, 1789-1860." Papers will be presented by Albert Simpson, Junior College of Augusta, Georgia, on "New England's Objection to the Three-Fifths Ratio"; by A. Y. Lloyd, Morehead State Teachers College, on "Propaganda and Public Opinion"; by Raymond Hooker, WPA Survey, on "From Pressure Politics to Political Action in Michigan"; and by Samuel Johnson, Harris Teachers College, St. Louis, on "The New England Emigrant Aid Society." The presidential address, "Democracy and the Southern Frontier," will be given by Thomas P. Abernethy of the University of Virginia at the annual dinner of the Association Friday evening.

"Bourbonism in the South" will be the subject for discussion at one of the Saturday morning sessions. Three papers will be presented: "Bourbonism in Georgia," by C. Vann Woodward, University of North Carolina; "The Farmers and Bourbonism in the Twentieth Century," by H. C. Nixon, Tulane University; and "The Growth of Class Consciousness in Southern Industry," speaker to be selected. Howard K. Beale, University of North Carolina, will preside and A. M. Arnett, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, will lead the discussion. The other Saturday morning session will be devoted to "Antebellum Southern Agriculture." The chairman will be Everett E. Edwards, United States Department of Agriculture, and papers will be read by Walter Prichard, Louisiana State University, on "The Louisiana 'Model Farm,' 1835-1841"; by Avery O. Craven, University of Chicago, on "John Taylor and Southern Agriculture"; and by Herbert A. Kellar, McCormick Historical Association, on "Solon Robinson's Impressions of Southern Agriculture." The meeting will close with a luncheon and business meeting Saturday noon.

#### PERSONAL

The principal address at the annual "Boone Day Meeting" of the Kentucky State Historical Society, which assembled in the Old Statehouse at Frankfort, was delivered by Miss Mary Verhoeff of Louisville. Her subject was "Early Louisville Newspapers."

C. C. Crittenden, secretary of the North Carolina Historical Commission, addressed the annual meeting of the North Carolina Society, Sons of the American Revolution, in Raleigh, April 17, on the subject "Common Sense and the American Revolution."



Edmund C. Gass, instructor in history and political science at the University of Tennessee, has been appointed editorial associate for the *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications*.

Watt Stewart, professor of history at Oklahoma A. & M. College, has returned to the United States from an extended leave spent in research and travel in Latin American countries. While abroad he had several articles published in magazines of Chile and Peru, including the *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía* and the *West Coast Leader*.

Academic summer migrations not previously noted include: Watt Stewart of Oklahoma A. & M. College to teach at State College for Teachers, Albany, New York; Herold S. Fink of Hibbing Junior College, Hibbing, Minnesota, and Carrol H. Quenzel, student assistant at the University of Wisconsin, to teach at West Virginia University during the first and second terms, respectively; Walter B. Posey of Birmingham-Southern College to teach at the University of Alabama; W. E. Caldwell of the University of North Carolina to teach at the University of Michigan; J. C. Ballagh of the University of Pennsylvania to teach at the University of North Carolina; Hubert Searcy of Birmingham-Southern College to teach at Duke University; M. L. Skaggs of Campbell College to teach at Wake Forest College.

New appointments to become effective in September: Austin L. Venable, who received the doctorate at Vanderbilt in June, has been appointed to an instructorship at the University of Arkansas to replace R. J. Rath, who resigned to accept a traveling fellowship; Alfred B. Thomas of the University of Oklahoma has been appointed associate professor of history at the University of Alabama; Miss Catherine Strateman, who holds the doctorate from Columbia University, and Miss Jane Lohrer, graduate student at the University of Chicago, have been appointed instructors in history at the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina; W. Edwin Hemphill has been appointed assistant professor of history at Davidson College for one year to fill the place caused by the death of Thomas Wilson Lingle; Paul H. Clyde of the University of Kentucky has been appointed associate professor of history at Duke University.

Among personal news of recent interest the following items may also be noted: Joseph J. Mathews and David M. Potter of the University of Mississippi are engaged in research at Harvard and Yale universities, respectively; Miss Katharine Moser, instructor in history at the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, has resigned to continue graduate work at the University of Chicago; C. W. Williams of the University of Alabama will be on leave again for 1937-1938 to continue graduate work at Vanderbilt University; John F. Ramsey of the University of Alabama has been promoted assistant professor; Curtis H. Walker of Vanderbilt University has been granted leave of absence to

work on a life of Eleanor of Aquitaine and will spend the coming year in France; Thomas P. Govan, who received the doctorate at Vanderbilt University in June, has been awarded a scholarship by the Rosenwald Foundation to investigate banking and credit in the Old South; Francis G. Davenport of Transylvania College is engaged in research in Nashville during the summer; S. T. McCoy of Duke University has been awarded a Social Science Research Council grant-in-aid for summer research in France on French social history.

#### HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The Texas State Historical Association assembled for its fortieth annual meeting at Austin, April 23-24. At the general session held Friday afternoon, April 23, the following papers were read: "Historic Survey of Indians of Texas," by Mildred Pickle Mayhall; "Amusements in the Republic of Texas," by William R. Hogan; "Local Archives of Texas and Their Use for Historic Research," by Claude Keltner; and "The Founding of Presidio, Texas," by Carlos E. Castañeda. Another general session held Saturday afternoon embraced papers by Retta Murphy on the "Journey of Inspector General Pedro de Rivera, 1724-1728"; by R. B. Blake on the "Location of Early Spanish Missions and Presidio in Nacogdoches County"; and by Frank J. Studer on the "Panhandle Pueblo Ruins." L. W. Kemp made the address at the annual dinner of the Association.

On March 31 the Dallas Historical Society celebrated its fifteenth anniversary. Judge T. L. McCullough presented a gold seal of the Society on behalf of the organization to its president and founder, Mr. G. B. Dealey. Mr. Joe E. Lawther, chief speaker at the meeting, discussed the Society's activities since its inception and commented in detail upon its site-marking program of the past two years. Under its auspices seven sites significant in the history of the county have already been commemorated and other markers are projected.

The Society's collection has recently been augmented by the deposit of material relative to the Hall of State historical exhibit of the Texas Centennial. This includes photostats of material lent the exhibit by the Texas State Library and the University of Texas Archives. Transcripts of other documents exhibited were also presented to the Society. Other recent donations of interest are: a headright certificate issued by the Republic of Texas; a bill of sale for cattle giving many of the cattlebrands in use in the early days; photostats of papers of J. M. Patterson, the first merchant of Dallas; the Crutchfield-Lane Collection relating to the family of Thomas Crutchfield, who built Dallas' first hotel; the Colonel William L. Crawford Papers; and photostats of the Beale Colony Papers, presented by the University of Texas.

The Oklahoma Historical Society has recently received two tons of records from the Comanche County courthouse at Lawton.

The Tennessee Historical Society has published a comprehensive index of Volumes I to IX (1915-1928) of the *Tennessee Historical Magazine*. This index, which has been prepared under the direction of Professor William C. Binkley of Vanderbilt University, is designated as Volume X of Series I, and brings that series to a close. The Society is now working on plans for the resumption of the publication of the *Magazine* on a regular basis.

The Library of the Florida Historical Society, which is located in a special room in the Willow Branch Library in Jacksonville, is being carefully reorganized and indexed this summer under the supervision of the librarian, Watt Marchman. A published index of the Society's complete collection is contemplated.

A valuable gift was recently received from former-Senator W. H. Milton of Marianna, Florida, consisting of the Governor John Milton Papers. These include the governor's letterbook, 1861-1862, and a few letters from Stephen R. Mallory, secretary of the Confederate navy, to the state executive. Other papers of Governor Milton were destroyed by fire several years ago.

On May 9, 1937, the Huguenot Society of South Carolina unveiled a granite cross marking the site of the place of worship of the original Huguenot settlement near McCormick. An address was delivered by Alex S. Salley, secretary of the Historical Commission of South Carolina, on "The Huguenot Settlement at New Bordeaux."

The Society of American Archivists held its first annual meeting at Washington, D. C., June 18-19. At the afternoon session of June 18, the following papers were given: "The Control of Manuscripts and Manuscript Collections," by Thomas P. Martin; "The Significance and Use of Business Archives," by Herbert A. Kellar; and "Pioneering for a Science of Archives in the United States," by Victor Hugo Paltsits. Morris A. Copeland addressed a luncheon meeting on the subject, "The Significance of Archives to the Economist and Sociologist," and a round-table session in the afternoon discussed "Archival Practices and Procedures." Three addresses, by A. R. Newsome, president of the Society, James F. Kenney, and Ricardo J. Alfaro, were given at the annual dinner in the evening. At a general session Saturday morning, Margaret C. Norton spoke on "The Scope and Functions of a State Archives Department"; Philip M. Hamer discussed the "Federal Archives Outside the District of Columbia"; and Luther H. Evans traced "Archival Progress in the Historical Records Survey."

The Historical Records Survey has undertaken "a project for an inventory of early American books, pamphlets, and broadsides printed during such periods as to constitute important sources of American history, and for making a record of such material available to scholars, historians, and others." The date limit for the South Atlantic seaboard states is 1820; for West Virginia and Kentucky,

1830; for Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee, 1840; for Missouri, 1850; for Florida and Texas, 1860; and for Arkansas and Oklahoma, 1870. Douglas C. McMurtrie has been appointed Historical Advisor to the National Supervisor. While state directors of the Historical Records Survey will have charge of the program in each state, the co-operation of historians and librarians is cordially invited. Communications relative to the work should be sent to Mr. McMurtrie, 2039 Lewis Street, Chicago.

The American Documentation Institute, organized as a Delaware corporation, emanated from a meeting of delegates from national councils, societies, and other organizations in Washington, D. C., on March 13. The main objective of this nonprofit organization "will be to develop and apply the new technique of microphotography to library, scholarly, scientific, and other material. It will be able to conduct scholarly publication by various methods as required by co-operating organizations." Documentation activities conducted by Science Service since 1935 will be transferred to the new Institute. The board of trustees consists of Robert C. Binkley, Western Reserve University; Solon J. Buck, Director of Publications, National Archives; Watson Davis, Director of Science Service; James Thayer Gerould, Librarian, Princeton University Library; and Ludwig Hektoen, Chairman, National Research Council.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

The Emory University Institute of Citizenship held its tenth anniversary session, February 8-12. Proceedings of the meeting published under the title, *Current Economic and Political Problems* (Emory University *Bulletin*, Vol. XXIII, No. 6, March, 1937, 95 pp.), edited by Mose L. Harvey, centered about the United States and international relations, the problem of the Supreme Court, farm tenancy in the South, problems of local government in the South, social security, and modern public opinion. At the session devoted to farm tenancy, Rupert Vance presented a paper on "The Historical Background," R. W. Hudgens spoke on "The Present Situation," and Edwin R. Embree pointed "The Way Out." Local government problems in the South were discussed by Thomas H. Reed ("Local Government Reorganization" and "Reform in County Government in the South"), Murray Seasongood ("How Shall We Run Our Cities"), Frank W. Prescott ("The General Problem of County Government in the South" and "County Finances in the South"), and George Spicer ("Responsible County Government"). A "History of the Institute of Citizenship" was presented by Goodrich C. White.

The South Carolina Society has issued the seventeenth edition of its *Rules* (Published by the Society, March 30, 1937, 170 pp.), on the occasion of its two-hundredth anniversary. The volume contains, in addition to the Society's rules, the charter of incorporation, 1751, and amendments thereto; a roster of officers

and members; and an historical sketch of the institution, 1737-1937, prepared by J. H. Easterby.

*Constitutional Problems of Tennessee* (*The University of Tennessee Record, Extension Series*, Vol. XIII, No. 2, April, 1937, 115 pp., 25 cents), was prepared by the Department of History and Political Science and the School of Commerce to provide voters of the state, should they be asked to approve amendments or the summoning of a convention, "with information that will aid them in deciding whether any constitutional changes are required, and if so, the nature of the changes that should be made" (p. 3).

The Louisiana State Museum (New Orleans) issued on March 27, 1937, *The Life of Judah P. Benjamin*, a pamphlet of 26 pages. According to this publication, Benjamin's "Bellechasse" sugar plantation, located on the Mississippi River a few miles below New Orleans in Plaquemines Parish, is to be made into a National Memorial, sponsored by such bodies as the Daughters of the Confederacy, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Society of Colonial Dames, and the Louisiana State Museum. The pamphlet contains an account of the memorial project, a brief sketch of Benjamin, and a chronology of his life.

*True Stories in Texas* (San Antonio: The Naylor Company, 1936, pp. 365, \$2.00), by Annie Doom Pickrell, is a collection of fifty short sketches of incidents in the lives of Texans prior to 1845. Many of the names are easily identified by their importance in early Texas history. The stories are based upon family traditions and information furnished by descendants of participants. Credit is given to the individuals who provided the information, but the style of presentation is the author's.

*Some Presses You Will Be Glad to Know About* (New York: University Books, Inc., 1937, pp. 61), is a booklet calling attention to the plans, purposes, and accomplishments of eleven institutional presses. Included among them are the Duke University Press, the Louisiana State University Press, and the University of Oklahoma Press.

A recent report which bears upon conditions in the South is *Farm Tenancy, Report of the President's Committee* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1937, pp. viii, 108). Findings and recommendations of the committee are followed by photographic, technical, and statistical supplements which promote visualization of the problem. Under the topic "Factors in the Growth of Tenancy" (pp. 39-46), the following subjects are treated briefly: "Fee-simple Ownership of Land," "Disposition of the Public Domain," "Speculation and High Land Values in Relation to Income," "Conditions Arising from the Freeing of Slaves," "Economic Depressions," and "Conditions of Credit."

*Gloucester County (Virginia)* (Richmond: Cottrell & Cooke, Inc., 1936, 243 pp., \$1.50), by Mary Wiatt Gray, is the story of a tidewater county written primarily for use in its public schools. According to the brief bibliography, use was made of such source materials as county and church records and the *Gloucester Gazette*. A chronology records an "incomplete" list of events from 1606 to 1935.

A brief segment of military history is outlined in *Yorktown, Cradle of the Republic* (Hampton, Va.: Houston Printing and Publishing House, 1937, 35 pp.), by John J. Bucsher. The work is illustrated with sundry pictures and maps.

*What is Regionalism?* Harry E. Moore attempts to answer this question in *Southern Policy Papers No. 10* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1937, 16 pp.). Since "the idea of regionalism has not yet achieved a clear-cut definition which would be acceptable to all regionalists," he proposes a "working idea of the notion": "A region is an area large enough to display most social factors, distinctive enough to make recognition fairly easy, and possessed of a characteristic mode of life. A regionalist, then, is one who holds that there are important distinctions between fairly large-sized areas and that these distinctions must be taken into account in any successful attempt to understand or to direct the life of such areas" (pp. 1-2).

Historians will be interested in the author's "fundamental distinction" between sectionalism and regionalism: "*Sectionalism sees the nation from the point of view of the differing areas; regionalism sees the differing areas from the point of view of the nation*" (p. 9). After citing Howard W. Odum's "five primary distinctions," Moore passes to the Turner concept which "arose from a comparison of this country with Europe, and made sectionalism the counterpart of nationalism, stressing the differences between areas and therefore tending to overlook the more important interconnections and interdependencies. Even though such a picture may have been historically valid, better communication has now drawn the various parts of the United States into such close contact that separatism can have no valid or logical place in realistic thinking. Differences exist, certainly, and would be fostered by both sectionalists and regionalists, but with this fundamental distinction: *The sectionalist fosters differences for the advantage of his own area; the regionalist fosters differences that the contribution of his own area to the national whole may be the greater*" (pp. 9-10).

*A Richmond Album* (Richmond: Garrett and Massie, 1937, pp. xxiv, 211, \$3.00), by Earle Lutz with an introduction by John Stewart Bryan, is "A pictorial chronicle of an historic city's outstanding events and places" from an early period to the close of the World War. The album itself is prefaced by a brief historical background. There is no attempt to present a complete pictorial study of Richmond but the views will serve as a valuable reminder of the im-

portant scenes and incidents in the city's history. An explanation of each picture is given on the page facing it. The format is unusually attractive.

An anniversary edition of *Through the Years in Norfolk* (Norfolk: 1937, pp. 359) has been published by the Norfolk Advertising Board, affiliated with Norfolk Association of Commerce, for the Tri-Centennial of New Norfolk County and the Bi-Centennial of Norfolk Borough. It is divided into three parts: Book I, "Historical Norfolk—1636 to 1936," by W. H. T. Squires; Book II, "The Making of a Great Port, Norfolk, Portsmouth and Environs Today," by F. E. Turin; and Book III, "Commercial and Industrial Norfolk," by M. E. Bennett. Within the second division, "The Norfolk Public Library" and "Norfolk Public Schools" were written by Mary D. Pretlow and C. W. Mason, respectively. It is attractively printed on excellent paper and includes a variety of illustrations.

The Historical Records Survey has recently issued in mimeographed form No. 1 of "An Inventory of the Manuscript Collection of the Department of Middle America Research" of Tulane University (New Orleans, 1937, pp. 28). This inventory of the "Callender I. Fayssoux Collection of William Walker Papers" was begun under the general direction of Lyle Saxon, state director of the Historical Records Survey, and completed under his successor, John C. L. Andreassen. The project supervisor was Dr. Gaspar Lugano. "The scholar interested in filibusterers and filibustering, in 'Manifest Destiny' in Latin America and its relation to United States history cannot neglect these important materials."

*A Short-Title List of Books, Pamphlets and Broad-sides Printed in Mississippi, 1811 to 1830* (Chicago: 1936, pp. 47), by Douglas C. McMurtrie, was "Printed and mimeographed as manuscript for checking by interested librarians and bibliographers." With the suggestion that his study is "Subject to revision and amplification," Mr. McMurtrie presents the results of his search for early Mississippi imprints and appeals for information that will assist in completing the task.

The University of Kentucky Library has recently acquired a large collection of public papers from the auditor's office at Frankfort.

Birmingham-Southern College has been admitted to participation in "The McGregor Plan." The \$1000 per year income will be spent for the purchasing of rare books on the history of Alabama and the Old Southwest.

Articles on the Upper South: "John W. M. Lee, 1848-1896," by Ruth Lee Briscoe, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (March); "Sergeant John Champe and Certain of His Contemporaries," by W. B. McGroarty, and "An Introduction to the History of Bermuda," first installment, by W. F. Craven, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (April); "Child-

Labor Reforms in North Carolina Since 1903," by Elizabeth Huey Davidson, and "Gold Mining: A Forgotten Industry of Ante-Bellum North Carolina," concluded, by Fletcher Melvin Green, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April); "Sam Houston," by Hill McAlister, "Tennessee's Interest in the Texan Revolution, 1835-1836," by Robert F. Karsch, "Indian Affairs in the Southwest Territory, 1790-1796," by Randolph C. Downes, and "Francis Nash, Soldier and Patriot," by Linell Chenault Rogers, in the *Tennessee Historical Magazine* (January); "1937 Flood at Louisville," by Gustave A. Breaux, "Robert J. Breckinridge During the Civil War," by Hambleton Tapp, and "John Bradford, Not Thomas Parvin, First Printer in Kentucky," by Samuel M. Wilson, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (April); "Howard High School, The Outstanding Pioneer Coeducational High School in Missouri," by Dorothy B. Dorsey, "Cadet Chouteau, An Identification," by John Francis McDermott, "Plank Roads in Missouri," by North Todd Gentry, and "The Career of James Proctor Knott in Missouri," by Edwin W. Mills, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (April); "The Father of Sequoyah: Nathaniel Gist," by Samuel C. Williams, "Chief William Potter Ross," by John Bartlett Meserve, "How the Cherokees Acquired the Outlet," by Berlin B. Chapman, "The Mayes," by John Bartlett Meserve, "Early Life Among the Five Civilized Tribes," by Edward Davis, and "The Origin of the Seminole Indians," by Gerald Forbes, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (March).

Documents and compilations on the Upper South: "Letters of James Rumsey," edited by James A. Padgett, "A New Map of the Province of Maryland in North America," by J. Louis Kuethe, "Baltimore County Land Records of 1633," contributed by Louis Dow Scisco, and "Letters of Charles Carroll, Barrister," continued, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (March); "Notes about Williamsburg, 1780-1783," contributed by Department of Research and Education, Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., "Notes about Williamsburg," contributed by G. H. S. King, "Washington's Boyhood Home," by G. H. S. King, and "Two Unrelated John Halls of Amelia County, Virginia," by W. B. Hall, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (April); "The Origin of the Dabney Family of Virginia," by Charles William Dabney, "Digest of William Fitzhugh Letters and Chart," contributed by Fitzhugh Knox, "Letters from Old Trunks [Two Letters from Henry Clay (Private)]," contributed by Mrs. Mary Buchanan Redwood, "Diary of M. Ambler, 1770," contributed by Mrs. Gordon B. Ambler, and "Notes from the Records of Stafford County, Virginia, Order Books," continued, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April); "Unpublished Letters from North Carolina to James Madison and James Monroe," edited by Elizabeth Gregory McPherson, and "North Carolina Bibliography, 1935-1936," by Mary Lindsay Thornton, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April); "The Letters of Doctor Samuel Brown to President Jefferson and James Brown," edited by James A. Padgett, and "The Pattons, A



Pioneer Family in Kentucky and Their Descendants," by Sara G. Clark, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (April); "An Indian Raid into Texas," edited by Captain W. S. Nye, and "The Diary of An Eighty-Niner," edited by James W. Moffitt, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (March).

Articles on the Lower South: "The Union Bank of Tallahassee," by Kathryn T. Abbey, and "Early Orange Culture in Florida and the Epocal Cold of 1835," by T. Frederick Davis, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April); "Creek-American Relations, 1782-1790," by Randolph C. Downes, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June); "An Analysis of the Secession Controversy in Mississippi, 1854-61," by P. L. Rainwater, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (June); "The Marquis de Maison Rouge, The Baron de Bastrop, and Colonel Abraham Morhouse—Three Ouachita Valley Soldiers of Fortune. The Maison Rouge and Bastrop Spanish Land 'Grants,'" by Jennie O'Kelly Mitchell and Robert Dabney Calhoun, and "Don Juan Filhiol and the Founding of Fort Miro, the Modern Monroe, Louisiana," by J. Fair Hardin, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April); "The Free Negro in the Republic of Texas," Part V, by Harold Schoen, "The First Constitution of Texas, April 17, 1813," by Kathryn Garrett, and "Analysis of the Work of the General Council of Texas, 1835-1836," by Ralph W. Steen, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (April).

Documents and compilations on the Lower South: "Journal of General Peter Horry," edited by A. S. Salley, "The Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1765-1775," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, copied by Elizabeth H. Jervey, "A Plantation in Goose Creek in 1781," and "South Carolina Schoolmasters of 1744," contributed by Robert Francis Seybolt, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April); "The Defenses of the Floridas, Report of Capt. James Gadsden to Gen. Jackson, 1818," contributed by Mark F. Boyd, and "The Panton, Leslie Papers; Letters of Gov. Gayoso to Wm. Panton, 1797," in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April); "Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1784-1800," Part III, edited and translated by D. C. Corbett, and "Some Confederate Letters: Alabama, Georgia and Tennessee," with notes by Edmund Cody Burnett, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June); "Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana," LXXI, continued, translated by Heloise H. Cruzat, marginal notes by Henry P. Dart, revised by Walter Prichard, "Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana," LXXIII, continued, edited by Laura L. Porteous, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April); "M. Le Maire on Louisiana," edited by Jean Delanglez, in the *Mid-America* (April).

General and regional articles and compilations: "The Susan Constant and the Mayflower," Part I, by Minnie G. Cook, "Address at the Unveiling of Tablets on the Phi Beta Kappa Hall, December 5, 1936," by Dr. O. M. Voorhees, and "The Machiavellianism of George Mason," in the *William and Mary College*

*Quarterly Historical Magazine* (April) ; "The Course of the South to Secession," Part III, by Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June) ; "British Africa and the South," by Jackson Davis, and "Calhoun and the Modern State," by Charles M. Wiltse, in the *Virginia Quarterly Review* (Summer) ; "Civil War Letters and Dispatches," edited by Harvey Wish, in the *Indiana Magazine of History* (March) ; "Functions of a Local Historical Society," by Herbert A. Kellar, and "In Defense of Mrs. Lincoln," by C. C. Ritze, in the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (January, April) ; "The Influence of Personalities on the Public Education of Negroes in Alabama," Part II, by Horace Mann Bond, in the *Journal of Negro Education* (April).

### CONTRIBUTORS

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL is professor of American history at the University of Texas.

DANIEL M. ROBISON is assistant professor of history at Vanderbilt University.

ROGER WALLACE SHUGG is a member of the department of history of Princeton University.

F. GARVIN DAVENPORT is professor of history and political science at Transylvania College.

ROSSER H. TAYLOR is professor of history at Furman University.

# **William and Mary College Quarterly**

Devoted to the publication of  
original contributions and  
documents relating to  
Virginia history

\$1.00 A COPY . . . \$4.00 A YEAR



**THOROUGHLY INDEXED**

Published Quarterly by

**William and Mary College**

at WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

**Editors**

**JOHN STEWART BRYAN**

President of William and  
Mary College

**E. G. SWEM**

Librarian, William and  
Mary College

# The VIRGINIA QUARTERLY REVIEW

*A National Journal  
of Literature and Discussion*

"The Prometheans of the pen have appeared in its pages"  
*St. Louis Post-Dispatch*

SUMMER 1937

## CONTRIBUTORS

James Truslow Adams  
Conrad Aiken  
Hervey Allen  
Sherwood Anderson  
Charles A. Beard  
Ernest Boyd  
Roark Bradford  
James Branch Cabell  
Donald Davidson  
T. S. Eliot  
Havelock Ellis  
Waldo Frank  
Robert Frost  
Andre Gide  
Julian Green  
Aldous Huxley  
Joseph Wood Krutch  
Walter de la Mare  
Salvador de Madariaga  
Thomas Mann  
Sean O'Faolain  
Luigi Pirandello  
Katherine Anne Porter  
John Crowe Ransom  
Elizabeth Madox Roberts  
Bertrand Russell  
Carl Sandburg  
Arthur Symons  
Allen Tate  
Thomas Wolfe  
Stark Young  
Stefan Zweig

- Recipe for Conservatives by D. W. Brogan  
Myths of the Twentieth Century by Robert C. Binkley  
A Russian Idyll by Frederic Prokosch  
British Africa and the South by Jackson Davis  
The Novelist as Fortune Hunter by Lionel Stevenson  
Poetry by V. Sackville-West, Robert P. Tristram  
Coffin, and others  
Calhoun and the Modern State by Charles M. Wiltse  
That Apartment in Paris by Marie Kimball  
Art and Mr. Santayana by John Crowe Ransom  
Discussions of New Books by G. R. Elliott, F. Cudworth Flint, Virginius Dabney, R. P. Blackmur, John Cournos, and others.

Now in its thirteenth year, The Virginia Quarterly has published work of the leading writers of America and Europe and has introduced new writers of creative and critical literature. It has given particular emphasis to Southern problems but its pages are open to free discussion in the fields of literature, politics, economics, and the arts and sciences.

**The Virginia Quarterly Review, University, Virginia**

\$3.00 the year

75 cents a copy

---

---

# RURAL SOCIOLOGY

---

---

*Devoted to Scientific Study of Rural Life*

*Rural Sociology* is published by the Section on Rural Sociology of the American Sociological Society. Louisiana State University is its Guarantor.



## Contents of the June, 1937, Issue

*My Drift into Rural Sociology.*  
By Charles Josiah Galpin.

*The Future Population Prospect.*  
By O. E. Baker.

*Obstacles to Agricultural Progress in Mexico.* By Manuel Gamio.

*Streams of Internal Migration.*  
By Dorothy Swaine Thomas.

*Discordant Theories in the Field of Social Phenomena.* By Corrado Gini.

*The Life Cycle of Nebraska Rural Churches.* By A. B. Hollingshead.

*Fertility in North Carolina.* By C. Horace Hamilton and Marguerite York.

Notes, by E. deS. Brunner, L. A. Salter, Jr., D. E. Lindstrom, and Ralph Russell.

Current Bulletins. Edited by Charles P. Loomis.

Book Reviews. Edited by Carle C. Zimmerman.

News Notes and Announcements.

Books Received.



Manuscripts, communications for the editors, and business correspondence should be addressed to T. Lynn Smith, Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

**The subscription price is \$2.00 per year; single copies, 50 cents each**

---

---

# Virginia Historical Society

Organized 1831 • Chartered 1834

**DR. JOHN STEWART BRYAN . . . . . President**

Publishers of *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, now in its forty-fifth year.

## PUBLICATION COMMITTEE:

Robert A. Lancaster, Jr., Editor.

Dr. G. MacLaren Brydon, Historiographer for  
the Episcopal Diocese of Virginia.

Dr. Churchill G. Chamberlayne, Judge Daniel  
Grinnan, Dr. B. Rand Wellford.

Members in forty-two states, District of Columbia,  
Hawaiian Islands, and in twelve foreign countries.

Membership dues \$5.00 annually.

Magazine sent without additional charge to members.

**ROBERT A. LANCASTER, JR., COR. SEC'Y**

**LEE HOUSE**

**707 East Franklin St.**

**Richmond, Virginia**

FROM THE REVIEWS OF  
**UNHAPPY SPAIN**

BY PIERRE CRABITÈS

"Essentially a historical study, the book is written simply and directly in a penetrating style which, for all its brevity, displays the tangled Iberian crisis in its fundamentals."—*Boston Evening Transcript*

"Students of Spanish politics will find *Unhappy Spain* an excellent textbook, well documented and up-to-date."—*Nashville Banner*

"An astringent book . . ."—"Book of the Day" review in the *New York Sun*

"We doubt that any author has given a more interesting, informing, and succinctly logical analysis of the present unhappy condition of Spain than has Pierre Crabitès in his volume . . ."—*Brooklyn Tablet*

Cloth. 239 pp. \$2.50

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA

## The East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications

Published annually by the East Tennessee  
Historical Society, Knoxville

SOME CONTENTS OF CURRENT ISSUE (No. 9) READY AUGUST, 1937

*Papers from the Spanish Archives relating to the Old Southwest, I, 1783-1785:* D. C. and Roberta Corbitt

*Journal of David A. Deaderick:* Samuel C. Williams

*Edmund Pendleton Gaines: Railroad Propagandist:* J. W. Silver

*James K. Polk and Tennessee Politics:* Powell Moore

*Tennessee's Attitude toward Impeachment of Andrew Johnson:* J. W. Patton

*The Farmers' Alliance in Tennessee Politics:* J. A. Sharp

*Writings on Tennessee History, 1936:* Laura Luttrell

MANAGING EDITOR, S. J. FOLMSBEE, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Copies of previous issues containing numerous significant contributions to the history of the South available at \$2.00 each.

Annual Membership dues, including Annual Publications, \$2.00

Write the Secretary, Laura Luttrell, Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville